

A Family of Gods



THE WORSHIP OF THE IMPERIAL
FAMILY IN THE LATIN WEST



Gwynnaeth McIntyre

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

A Family of Gods



THE WORSHIP OF THE IMPERIAL
FAMILY IN THE LATIN WEST



Gwynnaeth McIntyre

A Family of Gods



THE WORSHIP OF THE IMPERIAL
FAMILY IN THE LATIN WEST



Gwynnaeth McIntyre

A Family of Gods

Celia E. Schultz and Sara Forsdyke, Series Editors

Hallowed Stewards: Solon and the
Sacred Treasurers of Ancient Athens
William S. Bubelis

A Family of Gods: The Worship of the
Imperial Family in the Latin West
Gwynnaeth McIntyre

A Family of Gods

The Worship of the Imperial Family in the Latin West

Gwynnaeth McIntyre

University of Michigan Press
Ann Arbor

Copyright © 2016 by Gwynnaeth McIntyre
All rights reserved

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publisher.

Published in the United States of America by the
University of Michigan Press
Manufactured in the United States of America

A CIP catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: McIntyre, Gwynnaeth, author.

Title: A family of gods : the worship of the imperial family in the Latin West /
Gwynnaeth McIntyre.

Description: Ann Arbor : University of Michigan Press, 2016. | Series: Societas:
historical studies in classical culture | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016013566 | ISBN 9780472130054 (hardcover : alk. paper) |
ISBN 9780472122189 (e-book)

Subjects: LCSH: Emperor worship—Rome. | Rome—Kings and rulers—Religious
aspects. | Rome—Kings and rulers—Influence. | Rome—Religion.

Classification: LCC DG124 .M35 2016 | DDC 292/.213—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2016013566>

καὶ οἱ τὰ τε ἄλλα ὅσα τῇ γε Λιουίᾳ ἐδέδοτο ἐψηφίσθη, καὶ Ἰν᾽ Ἀθανατισθῆ καὶ ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον χρυσοῦ ἀνατεθῆ, καὶ ἐς τὸ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ Ἀφροδίσιον ἄγαλμα αὐτῆς ἰσομέτρητον τῷ τῆς θεοῦ ἐπὶ ταῖς ὁμοίαις τιμαῖς ἱερωθῆ, σηκός τε ἴδιος οἰκοδομηθῆ, καὶ ἱερῆς εἴκοσιν οὐχ ὅτι ἄνδρες ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκες γένωνται.

What had been given to Livia they (also) voted to [Drusilla]: that she be deified; a golden effigy be erected in the senate-house; in the temple of Venus in the Forum a statue of her be dedicated, of equal size to that of the goddess and with similar honors; also that a shrine to her be built, and that she have twenty priests, not only men but also women.

Cassius Dio 59.11.2–3

Acknowledgments

This book began as a doctoral thesis written under the guidance of Greg Woolf and Jill Harries at the University of St Andrews, and I owe a debt of gratitude for their patience, expert advice, and diligent oversight as this project came to fruition. The insightful comments of my examiners, Alastair Small and Jason König, helped pave the way for the journey from thesis to monograph. The DAAD fellowship I received in the final stages of my PhD to work at the Max-Weber Kolleg at the Universität Erfurt with Jörg Rüpke gave me a chance to visualize the thesis I should have written, which then became the starting point for this monograph. A postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Manitoba in 2011–2012 gave me the opportunity to expand my study, and the epilogue is the result of my time there. I owe special thanks to Lea Stirling for this opportunity, for her expertise and willingness to read over and discuss everything I sent her way, and for her help in guiding me through the late antique material.

Earlier versions of this material were presented in various forms in a multitude of different avenues both while I was working on my PhD and over the last several years. This work has benefited from the numerous comments and questions from the audiences on those occasions, those willing to read over sections of this work, and those with whom I had conversations that helped shape and focus my arguments, specifically Clifford Ando, Duncan Fishwick, Karl Galinsky, Richard Gordon, Jon Hall, Greg Rowe, Jörg Rüpke, Celia Schultz, and Lea Stirling. Thanks are also due to Bill Richardson, whose meticulous reading of the entire manuscript helped me to clarify the presentation of some of the material and prepare the manuscript for final publication. I also thank Ellen Bauerle, Susan Cronin, Kevin Rennells, and their whole team at the University of Michigan Press for their help and guidance in turning the manuscript into a book as well as the two anonymous readers for their comments. Their helpful insight and suggestions helped tighten up some of the argumentation. All remaining errors are my own.

The transition from thesis to monograph could not have been undertaken without the support from the departments in the various universities in which I have worked over the last five years: Thorneloe University, the University of Manitoba, the University of British Columbia, and the University of Otago. These departments have

provided me with a variety of opportunities and support, enabling me to share my research through seminars, invited talks, and conferences. In addition, my ideas, interpretations, and analyses have all benefited from informal chats in the hallways and over coffee with the exceptional colleagues with whom I have had the pleasure of working.

Finally, this book is dedicated to my family, who have always supported me throughout my academic journey and my various moves across the globe. Without their advice, understanding, and love, this project would have never been possible.

Contents

List of Abbreviations

Introduction

Chapter 1. Center and Periphery: The Establishment of Cult to the Emperor and Members of His Family

Chapter 2. Not Quite Gods: Priests of Living and Nondeified Members of the Imperial Family

Chapter 3. *Divi* in the Provinces: Priesthoods, Honors, and Sacred Space

Chapter 4. Female Divinities: The *Divae* and Their Priests

Chapter 5. Magistrates or Priests? The **Augustales*

Conclusion

Epilogue: Aeternae Memoriae: The Persistence of Imperial Cult Practices in Late Antique North Africa

Appendices

Appendix 1: Municipal Priests (Male) Dedicated to the Worship of Individual *Divi*

Appendix 2: Municipal Priestesses (Female) Dedicated to the Worship of Individual *Divae*

Appendix 3: Dedications Made to the Gods by **Augustales*

Footnotes

Bibliography

Index Locorum

General Index

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of Greek and Latin authors and their works follow those of the Oxford Latin Dictionary, Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek English Lexicon, or Oxford Classical Dictionary, as appropriate. Other abbreviations are as follows.

- AE** *Année épigraphique: Revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'antiquité romaine*. Paris, 1888–.
- AHB** *Ancient History Bulletin*
- AJA** *American Journal of Archaeology*
- AJPh** *American Journal of Philology*
- ANRW** *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Series 1: von den Anfängen Roms bis zum Ausgang der Republik*. Berlin.
- CIL** *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin, 1881–.
- CRAI** *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*.
- HSCPh** *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
- ICLW** *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*. By D. Fishwick. 3 vols. Leiden, 1987–2004.
- ILAFr** *Inscriptiones latines d'Afrique*. Edited by R. Cagnat *et al.* Paris, 1923.
- ILAlg** *Inscriptiones latines de l'Algérie*. Edited by S. Gsell *et al.* Paris. 1957.
- ILCV** *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*. Edited by E. Diehl. Berlin, 1924–1967.
- ILGN** *Inscriptiones latines de Gaule narbonnaise*. Edited by E. Espérandieu. Paris, 1929
- ILS** *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*. Edited by H. Dessau. Chicago, 1979.
- ILTun** *Inscriptiones latines de la Tunisie*. Edited by A. Merlin. Paris, 1944.
- IPT** *Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania (1927–1967)*. Edited by G. Levi della Vida and M. G. Amadasi Guzzo. Rome, 1987.
- IRT** *Inscriptiones of Roman Tripolitania*. By J. M. Reynolds and J. B. Ward-Perkins. London, 1952 (enhanced electronic reissue, 2009 <http://inslib.kcl.ac.uk/irt2009/>).
- JHA** *Journal of Hellenic Studies*
- JRA** *Journal of Roman Archaeology*
- JRS** *Journal of Roman Studies*
- RPC** *Roman Provincial Coinage*. Edited by A. M. Burnett, M. Amandry, and P. P. Ripollès. London, 1992.
- RRC** *Roman Republican Coinage*. Edited by M.H. Crawford. Cambridge, 1975.
- RS** *Roman Statutes*. Edited by M.H. Crawford. 2 vols. London, 1996.
- SCPP** *Senatus Consultum de Gn. Pisone Patre*
- SEG** *Supplementum epigraphicum graecum*. Edited by A. Chanotis, *et al.* Leiden, 1923–.

Tab. Siar. *Tabula Siarensis*

Tab. Heb. *Tabula Hebana*

TAPA *Transactions of the American Philological Association*

ZPE *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

The translations of Latin and Greek passages are my own unless otherwise noted. The expansions of the inscriptions are largely based on those found in the *ILS*, *IRT*, and Bassignano 1974 or are my own.

Introduction

Roman politics and religion were inherently linked as the Romans attempted to explain the world and their own place within it. As the territory controlled by Rome expanded and power in the city of Rome became consolidated into the hands of one man, people throughout the empire sought to define their relationship with this individual by granting honors.¹ These power relationships were defined through these honors and the rituals and sacrifices associated with them.² This began with the deification of Julius Caesar in 42 BCE. From the death of Julius Caesar to the death of Constantine, more than sixty individuals were officially deified in the city of Rome. However, a study of the honors granted to the emperors tells only part of the story. Almost half of the individuals deified *were not* emperors.³ This group included wives, sisters, daughters, sons, nieces, grandmothers, and grandsons. How do honors granted to these individuals relate to power dynamics within the empire? This book turns the discussion away from *emperor worship* and back to a study of *imperial cult*. Here, I use the term *imperial cult* to denote a collection of rituals, priesthoods, temples and other sacred spaces that commemorated and promoted the emperor and his entire family and invited the whole empire to participate in their worship.⁴

The Study of Imperial Cult Practices and Geographic Considerations

The practice of deifying members of the imperial family provides key insights into the religious and political landscape of the city of Rome. This practice was not based on one specific model, and it had a certain amount of fluidity, developing and evolving as the religious and political landscape of Rome changed.⁵ The act of deification did not only serve a religious purpose.⁶ In many cases, deification served to legitimize the position of the successor, as is demonstrated by Octavian's use of the term *divi filius* and the promotion of his familial connections during his contest for power with Mark Antony.⁷ The honor of deification developed as the emperor and members of his family received an increasing number of exceptional and nearly divine honors, each one building on those granted previously and culminating in the gift of divine status.⁸ This interpretation suggests a lack of fundamental division between gods and men.⁹ Deification also served to define power relationships, especially between ruler and subject, and can be interpreted within the context of gift giving.¹⁰ In

many cases, mostly those involving the deification of small children and other family members, the act of deification and the ritual surrounding the *consecratio* resulted in a change in status not only of the individual deified but also of those immediately connected to him or her. In these cases of the consecration of small children, the promotion of these individuals to divine status served as a way to console the imperial family for their loss as well as involve the entire empire in their commemoration.¹¹

The study of imperial cult practices has been largely shaped by Price's monumental *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. His work presents a way of examining ritual practice not only as a series of honors presented to the emperor but as a way of defining the imperial power structure itself.¹² This avenue of study has then been expanded to other geographic areas.¹³ More recently, studies have focused on the localized aspect of the emperors' worship to discuss power dynamics within particular provinces and communities—specifically between the ruling elite in those communities and the imperial power structure and as a means of self-promotion for those elites within the communities themselves.¹⁴ Most of these studies have focused on the figure of the emperor himself, a distinction that has been made more pronounced as scholars have shifted from the term *imperial cult* toward terminology such as *emperor worship* or *ruler cult* to redirect the discussion away from the idea that a cohesive and uniform collection of practices was exported from Rome to the provincial communities.¹⁵ However, this shift to discussions of ruler cult tend to ignore almost half of the other individuals who were deified in Rome, a group comprising wives, sisters, children, and other members of the imperial family.¹⁶

If we can consider the importance of the imperial cult for the development of the power dynamic between subject and ruler that has been clearly demonstrated throughout the empire, how do the practices associated with the worship of other members of the family fit into this model? What did provincial elites and the communities in which they lived hope to gain through their connection with the emperor and members of his family? Zsuzsanna Várhelyi has demonstrated the importance of provincial priesthoods dedicated to the worship of the imperial family within the *cursus honorum* in imperial Rome and specifically as a stepping-stone for provincial elites to reach the Senate.¹⁷ Emily Hemelrijk's work has been instrumental in highlighting the duties and functions of female priestesses within their communities and promoting the importance of the public role of women within the context of imperial cult.¹⁸ Carlos Noreña has recently examined the importance of ideological unification—specifically through honorific dedications and praise language

directed toward the emperor—for defining the power of the various groups of local elites dispersed throughout the empire.¹⁹ This book expands these current discussions to include the important role not only of the imperial family members within this construction of power but also the female local elites (chapter 4) and freedmen (chapter 5), groups that were barred from holding political office but that regularly contributed to the landscape of their communities through civic benefaction and that played an important role in the cult practices associated with the worship of the imperial family.

This book focuses on how communities sought to connect themselves with deified individuals through the establishment of priesthoods dedicated to overseeing the worship of the imperial family. It examines the local manifestations of imperial cult practices and the decisions made by the members of these communities. The specific use of *divus* or *diva* for the deified individuals within the epigraphic evidence makes this a Roman phenomenon,²⁰ and although a strong Greek influence in the development of imperial cult has clearly been demonstrated, especially in the East, the western communities are largely influenced by their connection to Rome and their neighboring communities.²¹ As has been discussed most recently by Hekster, religious and cultural changes are not simply the result of the one-sided relationship between the center and periphery.²² Instead, one must look to local traditions, regional competitions, agency and individual initiatives.²³ This book examines the spread of one particular set of practices, the worship of individuals who had been officially deified in the city of Rome, how the worship of these deified individuals spread throughout the empire, and the kinds of decisions individual communities made about adopting these cult practices.

Following in the tradition of other geographic studies of imperial cult practices, this study is based largely on epigraphic and archaeological evidence from three groups of provinces: the Gauls, the Spains, and North Africa. This geographical area has been chosen for a number of reasons. First, Duncan Fishwick's work on the imperial cult—specifically, his multivolume *Imperial Cult in the Latin West*—has greatly expanded our understanding of the western provincial and municipal cults and has compiled much of the evidence for these practices. Although Fishwick includes other aspects of the imperial cult beyond emperor worship, such as the importance of the *domus divina*, *domus Augusta*, *numen*, and *genius*, he does not discuss in detail the importance of the *divi* who were not emperors or of the *divae*. His most recent focus on the provincial cult has allowed him to gather most of the evidence relating to how the various cult practices associated with the worship of the emperor by collections of

communities functioned within centralized provincial contexts. However, his starting assumption is that there was some central control over cult practices in the provinces²⁴ and that there were some rules and models for how cult was established, and on this basis he attempts to organize and categorize the complexity that was cult practices in the provinces. Although there is evidence of central control over many of the administrative and religious duties in provincial capitals in the Latin West, the same cannot be said for the decisions made by individual communities within those provinces. For this reason, this book focuses entirely on municipal cult practices to examine how individuals within particular communities negotiated the imperial power structure and their own place within it.

Second, much of the archaeological and epigraphic evidence for imperial cult practices in the provinces has been well studied and published within the context of “Romanization,” imperialism, and the expression of cultural and religious identity.²⁵ In addition to Fishwick’s work, there is also at least some foundational secondary literature on the imperial cult also related to these geographical areas, allowing this study to be contextualized within these discussions and our understanding of the empire as a whole.²⁶ Finally, out of the provinces in the Latin West, these provinces have some of the best epigraphic evidence, much of which can be dated, as well as a greater quantity of evidence (in contrast to surviving epigraphic evidence from Britain, Germany, the frontier provinces, and the Mediterranean islands).

Evidence for the Worship of the Imperial Family

The decision of who was to be deified rested, at least in theory, in the hands of the Senate.²⁷ Following the funeral and deification ritual, each newly deified individual was granted a priest, temple, and priestly college, although the surviving evidence for each of these features varies among *divi/divae*. The establishment of the rites of deification and what constituted “divine honors” are discussed in more detail in chapter 1.²⁸ In general, the sources that outline the deification (when they exist) tend to date from significantly later than the events they describe and for the most part provide more insight into the relationship between the *princeps* and the Senate than the worship of the imperial family.²⁹ However, the literary evidence should not be dismissed outright, as it can provide some additional details about how these practices were viewed from the perspective of the elite writers. This study includes some discussion of the literary references to the terminology used to define and discuss imperial cult practices, how the cult was established in certain cases, and the

overall perception of these practices.

The new status of this individual introduced a new set of terminology. In Latin, the term used to refer to these newly deified individuals was *divus* (or *diva* for women), which distinguished them from the other gods (*dei*) in most cases. However, this was not always so clear, as the discussion of Caesar's honors in chapter 1 demonstrates. However, the specific use of this term in the epigraphic sources in the western provinces does distinguish between dedications and honorific statues erected to living members of the imperial family and dedications and statues erected to those who had been officially deified, thereby allowing for a detailed study of which specific *divi* and *divae* were worshipped in which provincial communities at any given time. An epigraphic analysis provides more details than an analysis of the temples and shrines regarding the specific connections between the community and individual *divi/divae* since, in most cases, only the inclusion of a dedicatory inscription on a temple can ensure that it is correctly identified as a temple dedicated to the worship of the imperial family.³⁰ There are no distinctive forms for these temples, and the presence of statues of emperors and members of their families is not a helpful criterion, as not all statues were cult statues.³¹ This means that in most cases we cannot determine exactly which individual is being worshipped (or whether the imperial family is being worshipped as a collective), since the dedicatory inscriptions for temples rarely survive in the Latin West.

The inscriptions themselves rarely provide any insight into the ritual practices, prayers and sacrifices offered to the *divi/divae* in the Latin West. This makes it difficult to reconstruct the religious experience of those participating in their worship or how different ritual practices developed in particular towns.³² Many of these inscriptions are not found in situ, and many cannot be dated, further complicating a reconstruction of imperial cult practices in these communities. The inscriptions themselves rarely provide additional details beyond the name of the dedicator or the priest, the god being worshipped, and the nature of the dedications. This means that for this study, the question of how the worship of the imperial family was manifested in the communities is largely impossible to answer as a consequence of the nature of the evidence.

The presence of the inscription itself within a community (or when a community is mentioned in an inscription that has been moved) demonstrates that one particular individual (or group of individuals) was for a time at least responsible for overseeing the worship of named individual *divi/divae* or the *divi* as a collective. However, it is almost impossible to determine with certainty when particular

communities first established cult to the members of the imperial family for a number of reasons. First, the epigraphic record as it survives today is by no means complete. Not only have inscriptions been broken, moved, or reused, but many communities used other more perishable materials or materials that could be melted down or reused for their dedications. Second, not all priestly titles or dedications were immortalized on stone. We cannot know for certain when priesthoods of deified individuals were first adopted by individuals within particular communities. The knowledge of who held which priesthood at any given time relies on the inclusion of that individual's title when he or she made a dedication or was commemorated on stone. Finally, the sheer volume of inscriptions from the end of the 2nd century CE to the middle of the 3rd century CE skews the evidence in a particular way. This trend in the epigraphic habit has been analyzed in detail and appears to be linked to a desire within provincial communities to showcase their status and in particular an individual's Roman citizenship.³³ An analysis of this self-promotion through honorific dedications can provide insight into the ways in which communities sought to connect themselves with the imperial family through religious dedications, the local religious positions established within those communities, and the overarching framework of the imperial power structure.

The Imperial Family in the Latin West

The consolidation of power into the hands of one man brought about the creation of a new entity into the Roman political, social, and religious spheres: the imperial family. Once Augustus had secured his position as *princeps*, he set about promoting the members of his family through art (as in the procession of imperial family members on the southern wall of the Ara Pacis), building programs (for example, buildings named after specific members of his family and his mausoleum, which defined who was included in the imperial family), coins (focusing on the relationships between members of the imperial family), inscriptions (in which the entire divine lineage of an emperor was presented),³⁴ and religious appointments.³⁵ The position of the imperial family permeated all aspects of Roman life, and their commemoration became a focal point for religious institutions. Many of these imperial family members were granted divine status after their deaths, and communities sought to connect themselves with the emperor through worship dedicated not only to him but also to his family members.³⁶

This book examines how the cult of those individuals who underwent *consecratio* and received the title of *divus* or *diva* in the city

of Rome spread to the provinces of the Latin West. This study focuses specifically on municipal cult and addresses the question of interactions between the center and periphery with regard to the establishment of cult practices at a local level. Only in the past two decades has the discussion in modern scholarship turned away from central control over the peripheral communities to a more localized discussion of how communities identified themselves as “Roman” and of their interactions not only with Rome but with neighboring communities as well.³⁷ Most of the recent scholarship has questioned the imposition of ideas from Rome in almost all aspects of provincial life. However, in most cases, scholars still argue that the worship of the emperor and his family was primarily a Roman phenomenon imposed on local communities.³⁸ The most commonly cited example of this is the altar for the Tres Galliae at Lugdunum, established by Drusus.³⁹ This theory has been expanded to state that if the worship of the imperial family was not directly imposed from Rome, then it spread first to the *coloniae*, which then carried it into the far reaches of the empire or was established by members of the imperial family traveling in the area.⁴⁰ My study examines these two assumptions within the context of cult practice and religious development. It addresses these assumptions by focusing on the ways in which the different groups within the empire communicated with each other and with Rome and the imperial family to negotiate their own positions within the political landscape of the empire.⁴¹

The analysis is organized around individuals, particularly priests, and how those individuals promoted themselves and their positions within their communities through their connections with the imperial family. Chapter 1 presents the framework for the establishment of the worship of the *divi/divae* in Rome. It discusses the problems associated with the earliest establishment of divine honors for Julius Caesar in the city of Rome and how the Romans went about making an individual into a god. It then examines the communication between center and periphery for the establishment of cult practices by examining the establishment of honors to Gaius and Lucius Caesar in Pisa and requests to establish cult by two different groups from the Spanish provinces.

Chapter 2 discusses the development of cult outside Rome by looking specifically at cult paid to individuals who were not officially deified in the city of Rome, especially during the earliest development of the practice of deification, since many of these honors served as the foundations on which later honors were built.⁴² It examines the evolution of exceptional honors and how particular communities made decisions about the establishment of cult and which individual members of the imperial family would be worshipped. The fact that

many individuals were worshipped as gods in the provinces but were not officially deified in Rome suggests the absence of formal central control over cultic establishments. The introduction of cult served as a fluid means by which communities sought to connect themselves with the emperor and members of the imperial family, adopting practices that served a local function as well as connected individual settlements with the larger “Roman” community.

Chapters 3 through 5 focus on the individuals responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family in the Latin West. These chapters address the links between deification, imperialism, and euergetism.⁴³ The divine honors following one’s deification in Rome comprise a priest, a priestly college, and a temple/shrine (or in some cases a *pulvinar*). Chapters 3 and 4 examine how communities in the provinces acknowledged the divinity of these individuals by establishing their own local priesthoods. Chapter 3 focuses on the male priests and the deified individuals for whose worship those priests were responsible. The chapter highlights the connections drawn between particular *divi* and specific communities as well as the duration of that individual’s cult. Chapter 4 analyzes the cult paid to *divae* and their priests and addresses questions of gender divide among religious officials. Both chapters 3 and 4 involve some prosopographical analysis as well as an analysis of the role these individuals played within their particular communities.⁴⁴

Chapter 5 follows a broader discussion of the spread of cult practices throughout the Latin West. It examines the role of the *Augustales* and *seviri Augustales* (and other variations of the title) in the promotion and development of the worship of the imperial family beyond Rome. The focus throughout chapters 3 through 5 is on the worship of individuals who received the title *divus* or *diva* rather than the *domus divina*, the *domus Augusta*, the *genius*, or the *numen* of particular individuals, and on local gods with the epithet *Augustus* or *Augusta*. Each of these titles signified a part of the worship of the imperial family and played a role in the rituals largely collected under the heading of imperial cult, but this study largely focuses on the connections between particular communities and named deified members of the imperial family rather than the worship of the imperial family as a collective or in abstract terms.

Any study of Roman religion and the provinces encounters a number of problems. With the mention of religion, the question of belief always follows.⁴⁵ This book does not address whether individuals living in the Roman empire *believed* in their gods or even whether they *believed* that certain emperors and members of their families became gods after death. Instead, this analysis focuses on a

more commonly discussed aspect of Roman religion—the correct practice of ritual, “orthopraxis”—rather than on belief and dogma.⁴⁶ It is about community and familial connections. In general, the connections between individuals and their gods were expressed in public settings through rituals and sacrifice. However, the evidence for imperial cult practices in the Latin West is largely commemorative in nature and rarely includes more information than the name of the individual and the offices he or she held. In some cases, the inscription also refers to donations or dedications they have made, buildings erected, or public gifts (such as banquets). For this reason, this analysis does not address *how* the emperors and their family members were worshipped in the provinces but rather *where* and *by whom*. This is the focus of this study: to examine the role that particular individuals, families, and communities played in the spread of the worship of the imperial family throughout the empire.

Chapter 1

Center and Periphery

The Establishment of Cult to the Emperor and Members of His Family

The new power dynamic created by Caesar's position within the city of Rome following the defeat of Pompey and his followers was further defined through the establishment of exceptional honors by the Senate. The exact nature of these honors, when they were enacted, which honors constituted the establishment of a god rather than exceptional honors granted to a powerful statesman, and whether Caesar intentionally sought divinity during his lifetime have all been much debated by scholars.⁴⁷ For the purposes of this brief introduction to the nature of divine honors granted to members of the imperial family, this chapter presents three case studies. First, I discuss the honors granted to Caesar, which then serve as a model for the process of granting exceptional honors and ultimately deification of members of the imperial family. These honors are analyzed in terms of power negotiations, highlighting the ways in which individuals sought to connect themselves with this powerful individual and used the establishment of cult practices for their own purposes. I focus on the issues associated with the distinction between the rhetoric of *calling* an individual a god and *making* him or her one.⁴⁸ The second case study presents the exceptional honors granted to Lucius and Gaius Caesar by the community of Pisa and focuses on the mechanisms for establishing cult, albeit in this case to nondeified members of the imperial family outside of Rome. The final case study discusses two requests for permission to set up imperial cult practices in the provinces of Spain, one successful, the other not.

Making a *Divus*: Honors for Caesar and the Trappings of Divinity

The negotiation of appropriate exceptional or semidivine honors for Caesar began following the battle of Thapsus in 46 BCE, when the Senate decreed that a chariot and statue be placed on the Capitol.⁴⁹ According to Cassius Dio, the inscription accompanying the statue was to state that he was a ἡμίθεος. The use here of ἡμίθεος and the possible Latin word that Cassius Dio is translating has been the source

of much scholarly debate. Fishwick argues that this inscription, and other honors granted in 45 BCE, connect Caesar with Romulus, another demigod. In his opinion, the inscription would have therefore read *Caesari Romulo*.⁵⁰ Gradel proposes a reconstruction of *Divo Caesari*, arguing in favor of the term *divus* from Weinstock's speculative list.⁵¹ Gradel rightly argues that this Latin term, at least for Dio and his audience, simply meant a deified member of the imperial house. He then discusses the issues with Dio's choices of terminology since, in many cases, Dio uses ἥρωας as a translation of *divus*.⁵² Gradel argues that Dio would have chosen ἡμίθεος in this case because Caesar was still alive and thus for Dio could not be a ἥρωας.⁵³

If this reconstruction of the Latin term on the inscription is correct, then this is the only case in which a living member of the imperial family was identified as a *divus* during his lifetime. In the period following Caesar's death and Octavian's rise to power, this term came to signify members of the imperial family who had been deified after their death and is never used to denote a living emperor.⁵⁴ Servius, in his commentary on the *Aeneid*, argues that *divus* is the term for gods that have not always been gods (i.e., have been created from men), whereas *deus* is the term for the immortals. However, he admits that this opinion is the opposite of Varro's definition of the terms in *De Lingua Latina*.⁵⁵

“divum” et “deorum” indifferenter plerumque ponit poeta, quamquam sit discretio, ut deos perpetuos dicamus, divos ex hominibus factos, quasi qui diem obierint: unde divos etiam imperatores vocamus. sed Varro et Ateius contra sentiunt, dicentes divos perpetuos, deos qui propter sui consecrationem timentur, ut sunt dei manes.

The poet [Virgil] commonly employs “of the *divi*” [*divum*] and “of the *dei*” [*deorum*] indifferently, though there should be a distinction, in that we call the immortals “*dei*,” those created from men “*divi*,” as they have met their day [i.e., died]; from which we likewise call *imperatores* “*divi*.” But Varro and Ateius are of the opposite opinion, saying that the immortals are “*divi*,” that “*dei*” are those who are revered because of their *consecratio* [deification], as are the “*dei manes*.”

Here, Servius is summarizing the scholarly debate of his time.⁵⁶ During the reign of Octavian/Augustus (i.e., when Virgil is writing)

the term *divus* was given the meaning that was adopted by the imperial writers, although Wardle attributes some of the development of this term to Cicero.⁵⁷

The first surviving literary use of the term *divus* in connection with Caesar comes from Cicero's Second Philippic in his attack on Antony.⁵⁸ This demonstrates that the term *divus* was being associated with Caesar at least by the end of 44 BCE. However, it does not clarify whether this term was used in the honors granted before his death and, if we follow Gradel's argument, among the first of the exceptional honors granted to him in 46 BCE. In any case, according to Cassius Dio, Caesar later had whichever term Cassius Dio translated as ἡμίθεος erased from the inscription.⁵⁹ Moreover, if Gradel's reconstruction of this inscription is correct, then this is the only example of the title *Divus Caesar*. Once the title *divus* was used for defining and promoting Caesar's divinity, it was never used in conjunction with *Caesar*.⁶⁰ The divine Caesar was instead Divus Julius, demonstrating a marked shift from Caesar the man to Divus Julius the god. Cassius Dio's narrative demonstrates the careful negotiation on the part of both the Senate and Caesar to establish and accept appropriate honors as well as a number of issues associated with the granting of exceptional honors and the terminology used to promote the new status of this individual.

The next series of honors granted to Caesar follow his victory at the battle of Munda in 45 BCE.⁶¹ Cassius Dio does make a distinction between the image (ἄνδρις) of Caesar and the images (ἁγάλματα) of the gods, at least in terms of the procession. However, the inscription included on his statue base (Θεῷ ἀνίκητῳ—*To the unconquerable god*) placed in the temple of Quirinus is less ambiguous, although Fishwick argues that this statue was meant as a votive offering to Quirinus rather than a cult statue.⁶² His statue among the rest of the kings also hints at more earthly honors rather than divine. Although Caesar's connection here with Quirinus can be understood within the promotion of Caesar as a new founder of Rome following his victory at Munda, these honors seem to be an attempt to negotiate Caesar's ever-growing power within the city. This connection is explicitly promoted through the Parilia, a festival that originally celebrated Rome's foundation and instead came to celebrate Caesar's victory. For the purposes of this study however, the inclusion of his image among the gods in the *pompa circensis* served as the beginning of the use of this procession for the promotion of imperial family members and the position of the *domus Augusta* among the gods.⁶³

The context for the final set of honors, decreed in late January or early February 44 BCE, is unknown because most of them are

described in lists of honors granted to Caesar during his lifetime by the ancient sources. Cassius Dio states that Caesar was granted a festival (as to a ἥρως), a priestly college (called Julian) who would oversee the Lupercalia,⁶⁴ and one day of his own in connection with all the gladiatorial combats in Rome and Italy.⁶⁵ He then states that because Caesar was pleased with these honors, others were granted—specifically, his golden chair and crown should be carried into the theater in the same manner as the gods', building on the honor previously granted for Caesar's image to be processed into the circus. Cassius Dio also includes the addition of Caesar's chariot into that procession. The honors then culminate in Caesar being addressed as Jupiter Julius with a temple dedicated to him and his clemency and the choosing of Mark Antony as his priest.⁶⁶ Appian expands this list, stating that many temples were decreed to him just as to a god (καθάπερ θεῶ).⁶⁷

Suetonius's list seems to compile all the honors granted to Caesar before his death and includes the golden couch, the chariot in the *pompa circensis*, the additional college of the Luperci, and a special priest (*flamen*).⁶⁸ He also declares that Caesar received temples (*templa*), altars (*arae*), statues in like manner to those of the gods (*simulacra iuxta dei*), and a *pulvinar*.⁶⁹ If Suetonius's account is correct, then these honors clearly demonstrate that Caesar was granted divine status during his lifetime. In his Second Philippic, Cicero also mentions the *pulvinar*, *simulacrum*, and *flamen*, although he also includes the *fastigium* (the pediment added to Caesar's official residence).⁷⁰ Although this speech was likely published near the end of 44 BCE, it does seem to summarize the honors granted to Caesar before his death.

By the time of his death, many of these honors had already been implemented, but it appears as though this final set of honors was not. The temple to Caesar and his clemency was never built, and at the time of Caesar's death, Antony had not yet been inaugurated as Caesar's *flamen*.⁷¹ However, Cicero's attack on Antony, referring to Caesar as Divus Julius, suggests that this title for Caesar was already in use in 44 BCE.⁷² The title may originate from a *lex* passed before Caesar's death. The *Lex Rufrena*, dating either to the final weeks of Caesar's life or to the official deification by the triumvirs in 42 BCE, is referenced in several dedications made to Divus Julius.⁷³ Another inscription, dedicated to the *genius* of Divus Julius, states that Divus Julius was registered into the number of the gods.⁷⁴ Unfortunately, these inscriptions could date to after 42 BCE and therefore cannot confirm the exact date of the law.

Only one ancient source states that divine honors were granted to

Caesar immediately following his death. Plutarch, in his *Life of Caesar*, states that the Senate met on 17 March to establish a general amnesty and reconcile the two factions. He then goes on to say that the senators voted to honor Caesar as a god (ὥς θεόν).⁷⁵ This account is the only reference to the granting of honors at this stage, and it is likely that if this meeting did in fact take place, the Senate was ratifying the divinity that had already been bestowed on Caesar.⁷⁶

In each of these narratives, the ancient writers discuss the honors voted to Caesar and the terminology used to define his new status. Both the ancient authors and the individuals about whom they write are attempting to determine appropriate honors to promote the position of Caesar through the use of symbols and terminology associated with divinity. However, *calling* Caesar a god and actually *making* him a god are two different things. Although the terminology suggests that Caesar's position was presented in divine terms through the granting of exceptional honors during his lifetime, the surviving sources suggest that he was not *made* a god until after his death. The exact nature of how Caesar became a god highlights the complicated nature of the power dynamics, the motivations of influential individuals, and how new cults were established within the city.

Whatever Caesar's status was before or immediately following his death, a number of individuals then sought to connect themselves with this powerful figure immediately following his funeral by overseeing the establishment (or destruction) of a physical memorial and cult site for Caesar—in other words, by *making* Caesar a god through cult practice. The accounts of Caesar's funeral conflict in a number of ways, and it is not my purpose here to determine which more faithfully preserves the events that occurred. Instead I examine the different individuals who played a role in the unfolding of the events (as presented in the sources), the resulting establishment of cult practice to Caesar, and how these events clearly demonstrate the ways in which these individuals attempted to negotiate the power dynamics within the city that were left in a state of upheaval after Caesar's death.⁷⁷ In Appian's account, the people, having been incited to violence by Antony's speech, took Caesar's bier and carried it to the Capitol to bury it in the temple and to place it among the gods (καὶ μετὰ θεῶν θέσθαι).⁷⁸ They were prevented from so doing by the priests and instead carried the bier back to the forum and burned it there.⁷⁹ Appian recalls that an altar was then established on that location but that it was replaced with a temple after Caesar's deification.⁸⁰ Suetonius, conversely, states that a column was erected with the inscription *parenti patriae*, and was the site of sacrifices, vows, and the settlement of disputes.⁸¹

The conflicting accounts of the focus of worship dedicated to Caesar highlight the spontaneous nature of the establishment of Caesar's cult at the hands of the people as well as the tumultuous time following Caesar's funeral.⁸² The establishment of the altar itself is linked to Amatius (also referred to as Herophilus by Valerius Maximus) later in Appian's narrative.⁸³ Amatius is mentioned in several sources dating to this period, and he knew how to make use of popular excitement. Important family connections were drawn here as well, as he justified his actions in promoting Caesar's cult through his claim to be a grandson of Marius and cousin of Caesar.⁸⁴ This connection with Marius seems to have allowed Amatius to gain the support of a number of colonies of veterans, and he even was named *patronus* for a number of these colonies, distinguished communities (*municipia splendida*), and almost all the clubs (*collegia fere omnia*).⁸⁵ Appian attributes the erection of the altar to him and the resulting rioting and violence toward Caesar's murderers to his actions. He suggests that Amatius was trying to entrap Brutus and Cassius but that the rising support for Amatius ultimately threatened Antony's position within the city, leading Antony to use his consular power to arrest Amatius and have him put to death.⁸⁶ Yet after his death, his followers reacted violently against Antony, protesting his actions and calling on the magistrates to dedicate the altar and to make the first sacrifices.⁸⁷ This uprising was finally resolved by Antony's use of the military to put all those responsible to death.

Amatius was able to use the turmoil following Caesar's death to suit his own purposes and to use the establishment of the altar and his connection with Caesar to gain support and rally the people to his side. At the same time, Antony, also competing for support from those loyal to Caesar's memory, had to compromise with the various political forces and factions not only because of his role as consul and his need for the support of the Senate but also because of his rivalry with Octavian for the position of heir and his secondary position to Octavian in Caesar's will.⁸⁸ Young Octavian, with no political office but with troops at his disposal, was able to foster Caesar's cult and use these events to his own advantage. By continually pressing the establishment and ratification of the honors for Caesar in the face of opposition from Antony, Octavian was able to gain the backing of Caesar's supporters and succeed where Amatius had failed.⁸⁹

Octavian's victory over Antony in the contest for Caesar's supporters came with the appearance of the comet during the funeral games in July 44 BCE.⁹⁰ Suetonius states that the comet was then interpreted as Caesar's soul received into the heavens.⁹¹ This comet, later depicted as a star, became a symbol of Caesar's divinity and was added to a statue of Caesar in the forum.⁹² The witnessing of the soul's journey to

heaven then became an important feature of the process of deification for imperial family members.⁹³

The final set of divine honors for Caesar were decreed on January 1, 42 BCE, and this date is generally taken by modern scholars as the official date of Caesar's deification. The series of honors is outlined in Cassius Dio.⁹⁴ These included a temple on the original site of the funeral pyre,⁹⁵ an image together with Venus Genetrix which would be carried in the Circensian games,⁹⁶ vows of thanksgiving to Caesar (and to the victor) for any future victory, and the wearing of laurel to celebrate his birthday. Restrictions were also made relating to the day of his death and forbidding the carrying of his image in funerals of his relatives. Finally it was decreed that individuals might have sanctuary and immunity in his temple and could not be driven away. These honors were put in place by the triumvirs during the first meeting of the Senate and were ratified by the Senate. This appears to be the formal process for the establishment of cult or the introduction of new deities, and the sources that discuss the deifications of other members of the imperial family state that the formal decision for deification and the ratification of this act were in the hands of the Senate.

The temple itself served as an important ideological tool, further incorporating the buildings and space of the Republican Forum into a series of monuments commemorating the imperial family. The physical space for the worship of Divus Julius as well as its accompanying cult statue and priesthood clearly demonstrate that Divus Julius was now *made* a god. It was also used by later generations of imperial family members to further strengthen their connections with this *divus*. Although construction began immediately, it was not completed until 29 BCE. It is described by Vitruvius as being of the same form as the temple of Venus Genetrix in the Forum of Caesar, which further links these two *fora*, temples, and gods.⁹⁷ This temple later served as the backdrop for Tiberius's delivery of the public eulogy after the death of Augustus from the Rostra located directly in front. This speech helped Tiberius to secure his position as the new *princeps* and served to connect him with both Divus Julius, whose cult statue would be looking out at the proceedings from his temple, and his newly deified father, Augustus.⁹⁸ Velleius Paterculus clearly highlights Tiberius's own role in this act by stating that Tiberius did not call him a god but made him one.⁹⁹

It is difficult to reconstruct the exact progression of honors for the deification of Caesar, especially which honors were granted at which particular moments in time, because of the nature of our Greek sources and their use of a variety of terms to discuss these divine honors. Ultimately, following the death of Augustus, the honors

granted to deified individuals included a priest, a temple, and a priestly college, thereby adapting some of those honors granted to Caesar during his lifetime to signify the divine nature of imperial family members after their deaths. In some cases, communities sought to connect themselves with the living emperor through the establishment of a temple, a situation discussed further in the final section of this chapter. However, many of the other honors, such as an image being carried in the *pompa circensis*, served as models for other exceptional honors granted to members of the imperial family. In each case, honors were expanded, adapted, and magnified over time. Many even served to commemorate members of the family who were not officially deified following their deaths, further blurring the lines between the human and the divine. This strengthened the position of the imperial family within the imperial power structure. This final point can be seen in the honors granted to Augustus's heirs, Gaius and Lucius Caesar, to which we will now turn.

Establishing Cult: Gaius and Lucius at Pisa

Once Augustus had established himself as the *princeps*, he sought to secure his legacy through succession. Many of his attempts were thwarted by the premature deaths of his chosen successors, but in each case, exceptional honors were granted within the city of Rome that built on many of the exceptional honors granted to Caesar, Augustus, and other members of his family.¹⁰⁰ Two of the successors, Augustus's grandsons, Gaius and Lucius, were the first imperial family members to receive honors on an empire-wide scale, including triumphal arches, public buildings, altars, and temples.¹⁰¹ The dedication from a temple built in Campania dedicated to Gaius and Lucius as heirs (*templum hoc sacratum her[edibus]*) promotes their connection to Augustus and Augustus's own divinity, which comes after his death.¹⁰² The exceptional honors granted to these members of the imperial family elevate the positions of other members—in this case, the emperor himself—within this divine landscape and create and reinforce this imperial power structure.

Evidence from the community of Pisa showcases the negotiation of power between one community and Rome and demonstrates how that community went about establishing cult practices for the dead princes. After the death of Lucius Caesar in 2 CE, the council of the *colonia* of Pisa granted a number of honors to him, in part through a directive from Rome (via a *senatus consultum*).¹⁰³ The council met in the *Augusteum* and a speech was made by Gaius Canius Saturninus, a *duovir*, concerning the augmentation of honors to Lucius (*de augendis honoribus*). The wording here suggests that certain honors had already

been granted to Lucius by the community during his lifetime, and within the list of Lucius's titles, we learn that he was a patron of this very colony (*patronus coloniae nostrae*). The location of this meeting, a temple to Augustus, further strengthens the connections made between this community, their actions in commemorating the imperial prince, and the emperor.

The inscription, which was set up in the community and records the decisions made regarding these honors, suggests that the community incorporated some aspects of an official senatorial decree ("as to what might please it to be done about the matter, about that matter the Senate decided the following...").¹⁰⁴ The *duovir*, Gaius Canius Saturninus, was granted the responsibility for establishing this cult, first by choosing ten men to assist him in the endeavor, then to determine which site should be purchased using public funds. An altar was erected and on the thirteenth day before the Kalends of September [20 August] public sacrifices of a black ox and black sheep showered with milk, honey, and oil were made to Lucius's shades (*Diis Manibus eius*). Further private sacrifices could also be made but could be no more than a single candle, torch, or crown to be carried out in Gabine dress.¹⁰⁵ Other restrictions and directions concerning the area around the altar are described, including that this decree and others granting honors to him should be set up on a large pillar.¹⁰⁶

The final section of this inscription clearly demonstrates the direct connection made by this community to Rome and the emperor himself through their actions. First, although this decree clearly outlines the sacrifices and rituals to take place, it stipulates that beyond those actions covered in the inscription itself, they will follow what has been decided by the Senate of the Roman people.¹⁰⁷ In this case, the council copied the directives from Rome and modeled its own establishment of cult practices on those designated from the center. Second, the inscription ends by stating that at the first opportunity (*prim[o] quoque tempore*), ambassadors will be sent to the emperor Augustus to secure permission for the Julian colonial citizens of Colonia Opsequens Iulia Pisana to do and follow everything outlined in this decree.¹⁰⁸ These concluding words highlight not only the connection between this community and the emperor's family (through the promotion of the fact that this is a Julian colony) but also the importance of the connection made through the establishment of ritual acts between this community and Rome and, by seeking the emperor's permission, Augustus himself.

After Gaius's death in 4 CE, Pisa established a public sacrifice on the ninth day before the Kalends of Martius [21 February] in the same place and the same manner as was established for offering a sacrifice

to Lucius Caesar.¹⁰⁹ This suggests that this community was following an earlier precedent, much in the same way as other honors had been established previously. Unlike in 2 CE, when the local *duoviri* oversaw the granting of honors, in 4 CE there were no magistrates to oversee the establishment of this cult because of some rivalry (*contentiones candidatorum*), the nature of which is left unclear in the surviving sources.¹¹⁰ The surviving inscription contains both the informal drafting of honors (following the format of an official decree) and the formal ratification of the decision after the magistrates had been elected.

The decree begins with a long list of the offices and achievements of Gaius Caesar and declares that his death occurred while the community was still mourning the death of his brother, Lucius. The honors that were then granted to him can be broken down into three groups. First, the inscription calls for public mourning (equivalent to that of Allia), which included shutting the temples of the immortal gods, the public baths, and all shops. It was also ordered that no public sacrifice, supplications, weddings, or public banquets could be held or announced and that no theatrical or circus performances could be held or attended on the day when his remains were returned and interred.¹¹¹ This list corresponds to similar observances made on this day (21 February) at the *Feralia*, or feasts in the memory of the dead.¹¹² This last day of the series of private celebrations made by the family (13–20 February) was reserved for public ceremonies, which in this case were being used for public commemoration of the deceased prince.

Second, public sacrifices should be offered in the same place and in the same manner (*eodem loco eodemque modo*) as those for Lucius Caesar.¹¹³ Instead of following a *senatus consultum*, as they did when establishing rites for Lucius, community members used the honors for Lucius established two years earlier as a model and then expanded the cult to include other honors. Finally, it was decreed that an arch be erected in the *colonia*, decorated with the spoils of the nations that had been defeated by or that had surrendered to Gaius and topped by a gilded statue.¹¹⁴ Statues of Gaius and Lucius on horseback were to be set up flanking the main statue of Gaius. This type of honorific arch was a new development in Rome, and although the decoration superficially followed republican triumphal arches, it promoted a new language of power that further legitimized the power dynamic within the empire.¹¹⁵ Lucius's inclusion in Gaius's arch highlights the importance of the family as a whole and its members' collective commemoration. Honors granted to the princes elsewhere, such as at Nemausus, demonstrate the establishment of collective worship and their sharing of sacred space.¹¹⁶ A funerary inscription to Lucius and

Gaius Caesar was found in the community of Trier and may have been adapted from the honors granted to them in Rome and in communities throughout the empire.¹¹⁷ In all of these cases, the brothers are commemorated together, thereby highlighting not only their connection to each other but also the importance of the imperial family as a whole. In Pisa, the two decrees were intentionally carved on stones identical in size, thereby creating complementary physical reminders of the two princes.¹¹⁸

The overall tone of this inscription varies greatly from that granting the honors to Lucius. This may result in part from the political situation within the community at this particular moment. Because there were no magistrates or prefects and no one else had jurisdiction, the decurions and the citizens of the community agreed among themselves (*inter sese consenserunt*) on a series of honors.¹¹⁹ The cult was to be overseen by the *duoviri* once they were officially elected. Until then, Titus Statulenus Iuncus, *flamen Augustalis* and *pontifex minor populi Romani*, was to be sent with an envoy to Augustus to make him aware of the honors granted by their community. Although the decision was described as being agreed upon by a group of *decuriones* and *coloni*, these honors also promoted particular individuals within the community.¹²⁰ In both decrees, the individuals present had their names immortalized on stone. However, in this case, although ambassadors were sent (to explain the current situation in the *colonia*), the named individual, Titus Statulenus Iuncus, presented the petition rather than the unnamed *legati* present in the decree for Lucius's honors.

Titus Statulenus Iuncus had connections not only with the municipal imperial cult through his role as *flamen Augustalis* but also with Rome itself in his role as *pontifex minor* there, and he would benefit from further connections forged between himself and the imperial power structure. In fact, in the latter part of the inscription, which outlines what happened with the delegation, the establishment of cult after the election of the *duoviri*, and the inclusion of these decisions in the public record, Titus Statulenus Iuncus is referred to as *princeps coloniae nostrae*. This new title clearly demonstrates a change in status that is directly linked to the actions he performed on behalf of the colony in this matter, and the use of *princeps* evokes Augustus's own use of that title. His earlier connection with Rome would also have contributed to some of the central ideas and consistencies found in the decree itself, as he would have witnessed many of the rituals and actions promoting the imperial family in the city and would likely have encouraged his community to follow similar formats to what he had seen in Rome.¹²¹

The localized nature of this decree is further highlighted in the titles given to Augustus and Gaius.¹²² Some of the official titles (such as Augustus as *pater patriae*, *pontifex maximus*) were included, but unlike in the decree for Lucius, some additional titles were granted, and all of them most likely have some direct connection with the community itself.¹²³ Within these titles, the community also uses the opportunity to state that it was still mourning Lucius, again referring to him as *noster patronus*. The granting of *patronus* was by decree of the decurions, and this position helped Pisa to secure its interests in Rome, connect it with the imperial family, and demonstrate its loyalty.¹²⁴ Gaius, although not officially linked to the community as *patronus*, is instead praised as the “sole defender of our colony” (*coloniae no[st]rae unicum praesidium*) and can be directly linked to the praise of Augustus as protector of the Roman *imperium* and defense of the whole world (*custodis imperi Romani totiusque orbis terrarum praesi[dis]*). Augustus as emperor ensures the continued safety of the world. Gaius, however, could be co-opted by individual communities as their own savior.

These decrees demonstrate some important ways in which cult paid to members of the imperial family was established during this early period. First, a senatorial decree may originally have described certain types of honors. However, each community could determine what honors would be set up locally. In the case of the honors granted Gaius, these do not appear to be modeled on a senatorial decree but instead seem to be based on honors decreed by the Senate to Lucius, which were then adapted and established by the community’s own initiative. Second, the most senior magistrates in the community were responsible for overseeing the establishment and continued practice of these sacrifices and other cultic rituals. If there were no magistrates, as was the case in the decree for honors granted to Gaius, the citizens of the community would take responsibility for the establishment of the rituals and would designate an individual to oversee the proper implementation of the decree. For these elites, the establishment of cultic practices to members of the imperial family played an important role in self-promotion, honoring not only the individual to whom the honors were granted but also the individual responsible for their establishment or implementation.

Finally, many of these honors were modeled on those granted previously to other individuals or on expanded traditional funeral honors. In the case of Gaius, his commemoration was linked to the festivals associated with the commemoration of one’s dead relatives, thereby linking rituals associated with the imperial family with the public ritual calendar. These honors were not necessarily fixed or adopted wholesale from Rome after the death of an imperial family

member. Communities erected or established temples, festivals, and other honors as they saw fit, although as seen from the honors set up to Lucius, they may have followed at least in part some directives from the center. However, the cost of establishing and maintaining these honors was exclusively the responsibility of the community itself, as can be seen in the final paragraphs of the decree for Gaius, which state that everything should be done, enacted, accepted, and followed forever by those who are *duovirs*, prefects, or other magistrates in our *colonia* in the future.¹²⁵

Petitions to the Emperor: The Establishment of Provincial Cult Practices in the West

Requests for the establishment of honors within particular communities did not always turn out in the way that the community envisioned. Although Augustus appears to have approved the actions of the local decurions in Pisa, other communities were not always so successful. Although the focus of this book is the municipal cult, two surviving literary references to requests by provincial communities in the Latin West illustrate how communities sought permission from the emperor to set up provincial cults. There is no similar literary evidence for how cult was established at the municipal level. Thus, before turning to evidence for the establishment of cult to the emperor and members of his family in their individual communities, it is worth examining the two different outcomes of the provincial petitions. These examples demonstrate the literary constructions of imperial power, how authors presented the emperors' reactions to that power, the context for the establishment of cult, and the importance of *exempla*. The epigraphic evidence rarely provides so much detail, so these accounts provide valuable insight into how elite authors in Rome presented these requests for cult and the spread of the worship of the imperial family into the provinces.

In Tacitus's narrative of the year 15 CE, following his discussion of gladiatorial games in Rome (organized by Drusus) and some problems in the theaters, we are told,

Templum ut in colonia Tarraconensi strueretur Augusto petentibus Hispanis permissum, datumque in omnis provincias exemplum.

Permission was given to the Spaniards, who requested that a temple to Augustus be built in the Tarraconensian colony, and a precedent was given for all provinces.¹²⁶

The temple itself is significant in that it served as a statement of the city's prestige, resources, and importance.¹²⁷ Tacitus's narrative highlights the fact that the temple was built at the Spaniards' request rather than as a consequence of a directive from Rome itself. This decision likely followed a similar process to what was recorded in the decree to establish honors to Gaius. The local decurions likely would have voted on the decision and sent a delegation to the emperor. All of this has to be inferred, however, as no epigraphic evidence from the earliest form of the established cult practices in this community survives. It may have been a similar situation to the honors granted to Lucius, where a community responded to a set of directives from the center. The lack of evidence does not permit us to go much beyond speculating about how exactly the decision was made and how the cult was established, but as in cases of the honors granted to Lucius and Gaius, the community apparently paid for the establishment of this temple out of its own public funds.

In the chapter immediately preceding this brief statement, Tacitus's narrative is concerned with a riot that had occurred in the theater and the resulting hearing in the Senate.¹²⁸ This passage has been discussed in detail regarding Tiberius's use of Augustan precedent, the importance of which I will return to in the second petition discussed in this section.¹²⁹ The stress of Augustan precedent and the actions of Divus Augustus with regard to the theatrical violence may help to explain Tacitus's inclusion of "and a precedent was given for all provinces," as the evidence does not suggest that this precedent was followed in the case of other cultic establishments. The context of this passage also provides some insight into imperial administration. Here, Tacitus appears to be following a list of decisions made by Tiberius while in the Senate during this year. After the description of the riot and this brief passage about the granting of permission for a temple comes the resolution of a protest against a duty that was directly linked to soldiers' pensions and finally a discussion in the Senate of whether the flow of rivers and lakes into the Tiber should be checked to help prevent flooding.¹³⁰ All of these appear to be routine matters to be dealt with by the emperor and the Senate, and the embassy to request permission for the temple should be understood in the context of the everyday administration of the empire.¹³¹ Tacitus is simply outlining the decisions made by Tiberius and the Senate during this year.

The other example of a community's attempt to set up cult to the emperor and his family had less success, and Tacitus's narrative again focuses on imperial precedent. In 25 CE, Further Spain sought permission to build a temple to Tiberius and Livia:

Per idem tempus Hispania ulterior missis ad senatum legatis oravit, ut exemplo Asiae delubrum Tiberio matrique eius exstrueret.

During the same period, Further Spain, having sent legates to the Senate, begged that on the example of Asia it might set up a shrine to Tiberius and his mother.¹³²

In this case, following a pattern similar to what has been seen in the examples of honors to Lucius and Gaius and the establishment of a temple to Augustus, the province sends a delegation to the Senate (rather than to the emperor directly, as was the case with the honors to Lucius and Gaius). However, in this narrative, the province directly cites a precedent—a decision made in 23 CE to allow Asia to establish a sacred space dedicated to the imperial family; namely, Tiberius, Livia and the Senate.

In the case of the Asian establishment, Tacitus draws a connection between the establishment of cult and the recent successful prosecution of Gaius Silanus, the proconsul of Asia, who was charged with extortion and a number of other crimes.¹³³ In this case, the granting of cult appears to be an act of thanks to the emperor for his actions in resolving this matter. There is a direct connection between the actions of the emperor and a community's desire to establish cult. Yet the cult was not initiated by the emperor. Instead, the community itself decreed the creation of the temple and then sought to have that decision ratified.¹³⁴

In the case of Further Spain, there was no direct connection between this province and the action that led to the establishment of this cult in Asia, and Tiberius rejected the request. Fishwick argues that this was because the guidelines laid down by Tarraco and Augusta Emerita were not followed here, since the guidelines restricted provincial imperial cult to consecrated, deceased members of the imperial house.¹³⁵ Yet his interpretation implies that there is a norm for the establishment of cult that permitted no room for innovation. This interpretation also ignores the importance of the rhetoric and use of *exempla* included in Tacitus's narrative of these events and his construction of Tiberius as an emperor. For Pelling, the importance of memory permeates this narrative, as does the idea that even good plans and actions can be forgotten following one bad decision.¹³⁶ This interpretation stresses the literary context of the narrative by comparing the actions (and resulting fate) of Cremutius and his construction of history with those of the people of Cyzicus who were charged with neglecting the cult of Divus Augustus.¹³⁷

The context more frequently discussed for this rejection of cult focuses instead on the responding speech rejecting the honors by Tiberius as constructed by Tacitus.¹³⁸ Tacitus has Tiberius cite Augustan precedent for the establishment of exceptional honors, and this speech in particular explores the issues associated with hereditary rule and the processes of imitation and interpretation as well as addresses the criticisms of Tiberius's rule and even criticizing Tiberius's critics.¹³⁹ In this case, Tacitus has Tiberius cite the temple at Pergamum to Augustus and Rome as the precedent for his acceptance of cult in Asia, since he observes all Augustus's deeds and words with the force of law (*qui omnia facta dictaque eius vice legis*).¹⁴⁰ He stresses the fact that in Asia's cult, he is venerated alongside the Senate, in whose company this whole event is taking place.

Tiberius then explains his rejection of cult in Further Spain in terms of following Augustus's own rejection of honors during his lifetime and as a defense of Augustus's honor.¹⁴¹ Throughout this speech, Tacitus is exploring the potential problems of succession—in particular, the complications of how successors can deal with the previous emperor both as a man and as a god.¹⁴² By following Augustan precedent in part but also stressing his own *moderatio*, Tiberius here not only asserts his position but also defines his role as emperor.¹⁴³ Thus, when taken in context, Tacitus's narrative of these events is more concerned with the construction of imperial succession and the figure of Tiberius than with the means by which cult established to the emperor and his family was accepted or rejected.

The emperor's rejection of this attempt to set up provincial cult in Further Spain did not dissuade communities from setting up their own local cults and priesthoods to the emperor and Livia. Although the priests of living and nondeified individuals is discussed in more detail in chapter 2, it is worth briefly mentioning the priesthoods set up to the emperor and his mother in the provinces of Spain as they directly relate to Tiberius's "official" rejection of cult. In Lusitania, three inscriptions survive that commemorate priests of living members of the imperial family. The first inscription, dating sometime between 14 and 19 CE, comes from the *municipium* of Olisipo.¹⁴⁴ This individual, whose name is now lost, was a priest of both Germanicus and Livia during their lifetimes. In Augusta Emerita, Gnaeus Cornelius Severus was a priest of Livia, also during her lifetime.¹⁴⁵ An inscription from the *colonia* of Pax Iulia refers to Marcus Aurelius as a *flamen* of Tiberius.¹⁴⁶ These three inscriptions demonstrate that even though the Further Spain's request to establish cult to Tiberius and Livia was rejected, this decision did not prevent individual communities from establishing priesthoods to living members of the imperial family.

The status of these communities also does not seem to play a role in their decisions about establishing these priesthoods. The fact that Augusta Emerita was the provincial capital of Lusitania did not prevent this community from having a priest of Livia even though Tiberius had rejected a petition from the delegation from Further Spain for similar honors. It could be argued that by initiating cult to living members of the imperial family, these communities were attempting to connect themselves with the ruling family and to gain their favor.¹⁴⁷ However this interpretation is problematic, especially for this period, when emperors were reluctant (or wanted to appear reluctant) to receive divine honors during their lifetimes, as discussed in the context of Tiberius's own rebuttal "speech" found in Tacitus.¹⁴⁸

In each of these three case studies, particular individuals or groups of individuals sought to connect themselves with the emperor and negotiate their place within the imperial power structure through the establishment of cult practices. Although it is difficult to determine their personal motivations for doing so, these sources clearly demonstrate some of the mechanisms for granting exceptional honors. For example, the honors granted to Caesar developed over time and were part of an attempt by the Senate and other influential figures to determine the appropriate honors for Caesar and to negotiate the new power structure developing around his person. As Octavian/Augustus further strengthened his position within the city of Rome and extended his power to encompass the whole imperial family, communities sought to establish their own connections with this new entity, following on directives from the center in some cases but largely adopting and adapting practices as they deemed fit. Finally, communities could seek the emperor's permission to set up cult, which could then be accepted or rejected. However, the emperors' decision relating to cult in one community did not necessarily affect the way other communities went about setting up their own cults.¹⁴⁹ Although the literary sources discuss the role of precedent in the establishment of honors, there was no universal standard for the establishment of cult and the adaptation, rejection, and acceptance of practices continued beyond these early stages of development as individuals and communities throughout the empire used these honors to define imperial power dynamics and an individual's or community's place within them.

Chapter 2

Not Quite Gods

Priests of Living and Nondeified Members of the Imperial Family

It has been rightly argued by a number of scholars that the worship of living members of the imperial family was common in the Greek East, drawing especially on the tradition from Hellenistic ruler worship.¹⁵⁰ Was this also the case in Italy and the western provinces? As Gradel has so clearly demonstrated, worship of the living emperor did occur in Italy, contrary to the conclusions expressed by Cassius Dio.¹⁵¹ Although significantly less common than the worship of deified individuals, there is evidence for the worship of living members of the imperial family during the earliest stages of the development of imperial cult practices. As the entity of the imperial family developed, exceptional honors were granted to specific individuals, which then served as models for future honors, ultimately culminating in the deification of some members of the imperial family. However, these practices were not then adopted wholesale by provincial communities. There was a significant amount of negotiation between communities seeking to establish appropriate honors and the members of the imperial family willing to accept those honors, especially during the earliest period of the development of these practices. Although the practice of establishing cult and priesthoods to these “nondeified” members of the imperial family is most pronounced during the earliest stages of development, there is evidence for cult establishments during the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE as well.¹⁵²

One of the most commonly discussed cult establishments for a nondeified member of the imperial family is Hadrian’s deification of Antinoös. Found predominantly in Egypt and the East, this cult was not the result of a consultation with the Senate and appears to be based in an Egyptian tradition of deifying those who drown in the Nile.¹⁵³ Antinoös then became merged with the Egyptian deity Osiris.¹⁵⁴ This cult was firmly rooted in Egyptian custom, and although it was well received in Egypt and the East, as can be seen through the many coins and statues celebrating Antinoös’s new status, his cult did not spread to a notable extent in the West.¹⁵⁵ In addition, although Antinoös was frequently represented in the West as Silvanus or

Vertumnus, he is rarely worshipped in such guises, and only one inscription, referring to a meeting of a funerary club (the *collegium salutare Dianae et Antinoi*) in Lanuvium, hints at a sacred space dedicated to him.¹⁵⁶ There are no references to a priesthood being dedicated to his worship in the western provinces of the empire. However, the establishment of his cult demonstrates the localized nature of adoptions of cult practices and the ways in which local communities sought to connect the worship of deified individuals with existing religious traditions.

Antinoös's deification is discussed in literary sources, helping to strengthen our understanding of how this process came about. However, in the West, the evidence for the establishment of cult practices to living individuals is largely restricted to honorific inscriptions (such as the *Tabula Siarensis* and *Tabula Hebana*) or commemorative monuments that include the priestly offices of a particular individual. Some of the best examples date to the period of the Julio-Claudians, when the construction of the imperial family and specifically the new role for the female members of this family is especially pronounced. For this reason, this chapter focuses specifically on these early practices and how communities sought to connect themselves and define the newly established order.

Semidivine Brothers: Germanicus and Drusus

Following and expanding on the exceptional honors granted to Gaius and Lucius discussed in chapter 1, two other imperial successors to the emperor (although in this case, Tiberius) received a number of exceptional honors during their lifetimes and after their deaths during the early development of imperial cult practices. The importance of these two brothers in the promotion of the imperial family is made explicit in a monumental inscription from an Arch in Gaul.¹⁵⁷ This arch is part of the ever-expanding number of commemorative arches dedicated to the imperial family.¹⁵⁸ The first part of the inscription refers to Germanicus, Tiberius, and Drusus, with all of their official titles. These titles include their divine ancestry, each tracing their lineage back to Divus Julius.¹⁵⁹ Germanicus also holds the office of *flamen Augustalis*, referring to his position within the *sodales Augustales*.¹⁶⁰ This inscription not only highlights the collective representation of the emperor and his chosen successors but also promotes the family as a whole, including their divine ancestors.

The second part of the inscription promotes the individual who was responsible for setting up the arch. Gaius Iulius Rufus broadcasts his own ancestry (back to his great-grandfather, thereby mirroring the ancestry of the imperial family) and highlights the fact that he set up

this monument with his own resources. He also holds the office of *sacerdos Romae et Augusti ad aram quae est ad Confluentem*. This title denotes a priest of the provincial cult of the Three Gauls, centered at this time at an altar at the confluence of the Arar and Rhône Rivers. Whether this monument was established as part of Gaius's responsibilities as provincial priest is uncertain. Regardless, this individual, who clearly had some connection with the worship of the imperial family, sought to promote himself and his family through the establishment of this monumental arch for Germanicus and his family. His list of ancestors runs parallel to the representation of the imperial family and served to promote the position of Gaius Iulius Rufus and his family through this monument.

Unlike Gaius and Lucius Caesar, Germanicus and Drusus also received priests during their lifetimes. The evidence for these priesthoods comes predominantly from Olisipo in Lusitania (discussed later in the chapter), as well as Nemausus (Nîmes) and Vienna in Narbonensis. In Nemausus, Severus Iulius Maximus is referred to as *flamen Romae et divi Augusti item Drusi et Germanici Caesaris*.¹⁶¹ A second inscription referring to the same title also comes from this community, but the fragmentary nature of this inscription means that the name of the priest is not preserved, and the inscription may in fact also be referring to Maximus.¹⁶² In any case, this title suggests that the deified Augustus was worshipped with his nondeified family members as part of a collective from the earliest development of these practices. In Vienna, Gaius Passerius Afrus is commemorated through an inscription listing the various offices he had held.¹⁶³ These offices included the positions of *flamen divi Augusti* and *flamen Germanici Caesaris*. This individual held two priesthoods, and although it is unclear whether he held these positions concurrently, it is clear that priests of the members of the imperial family were connected with or at least commonly responsible for overseeing the worship of other imperial family members as well.

Following his death in 19 CE, Germanicus received a number of exceptional honors, mostly modeled and expanding on those previously granted to Gaius and Lucius.¹⁶⁴ Some of the honors granted to him are briefly outlined by Tacitus, whose list appears to be based on the *acta senatus* and a *senatus consultum* passed sometime in the last weeks of 19 CE.¹⁶⁵ Others survive in two inscriptions set up in the communities of Siarum in Baetica and in Heba on the Italian peninsula, which also appear to outline the decision made in that *senatus consultum*. Unlike the surviving inscriptions outlining the honors granted to Gaius and Lucius Caesar in the community of Pisa, these inscriptions are largely unconcerned with specific honors established within these communities; rather, they preserve the

senatorial decree outlining the honors granted to Germanicus in Rome and elsewhere.¹⁶⁶ The text of the inscription itself stipulates that the decree of the Senate should be posted below the consuls' edict and that copies should be sent to the provinces to be erected within those communities.¹⁶⁷ The survival of these inscriptions provides key insight in how communities sought to connect themselves with the imperial family, acknowledge the status of this group, demonstrate their loyalty, and promote their own positions within the empire.

The *Tabula Siarensis* is restored to include the names of the consuls who oversaw the Senate meeting and proposal of the honors and states that the honors should then be sent to the *consilium* of Tiberius for him to review and choose which honors should be enacted.¹⁶⁸ These honors would also be discussed by Livia (Julia Augusta), Drusus (Germanicus's brother), and Antonia (his mother).¹⁶⁹ This demonstrates the important role that members of the imperial family played in the negotiation of appropriate honors. Although some of the honors or stipulations do not appear to be based on those previously granted to members of the imperial family, such as the stipulation that Germanicus's position as *flamen* should not be filled except by another member of the *gens Iulia*,¹⁷⁰ most of the honors granted to Germanicus are based on those previously granted to other members of the imperial family and it is worth discussing their importance in more detail.

Some of the honors granted to Germanicus are directly linked with those granted to Gaius and Lucius Caesar. The *Tabula Hebana* states that five new centuries named after Germanicus to be added to the existing ten centuries named after Gaius and Lucius Caesar.¹⁷¹ Both Tacitus and the *Tabula Hebana* refer to the inclusion of the name of Germanicus within the Salian Hymns, an honor that was granted to Gaius and Lucius Caesar as well.¹⁷² In addition to the use of his name in these particular instances, sacrifices were performed on the altar outside his tomb on the anniversary of his death by the *sodales Augustales* in the same manner (*eodem ritu sacrifici*) as those made to the shades of Gaius and Lucius.¹⁷³ Finally, this decree should be inscribed and erected in the same way as those passed for Gaius and Lucius.¹⁷⁴ The inscriptions clearly link the honors granted to Germanicus with those granted previously to other imperial princes and demonstrate the ways in which exceptional honors developed and were implemented within Rome and the communities of the empire.

Not all honors granted to Germanicus were modeled on those granted to Lucius and Gaius (at least as outlined in the surviving sources), and some draw on honors previously granted to Caesar and to Marcellus. For example, a curule chair for Germanicus was placed

among the chairs of the *sodales Augustales*.¹⁷⁵ Although there is no evidence suggesting that this honor was granted to Gaius or Lucius, a curule chair for Marcellus was placed in the midst of the officials in charge of the games in the theater at the *Ludi Romani* after his death in 23 BCE.¹⁷⁶ In addition, Germanicus's statue was to be included in the *pompa circensis*, an honor granted to Caesar in 45 BCE (discussed in chapter 1) as well as to Marcellus.¹⁷⁷ These honors reflect the increased importance of the promotion of imperial family, the ways in which these individuals were incorporated into the ritual landscape of the city, and the use of physical reminders for their commemoration.

Many of these honors also make direct connections between the members of the imperial family (both dead and alive) in addition to being adapted from previous honors granted to those family members. Germanicus's commemorative arches were preceded by those of his father, Drusus (on the Via Appia, 9 BCE), and of Lucius and Gaius Caesar (in Pisa, 4 CE; discussed in chapter 1).¹⁷⁸ However, Germanicus's arch in Rome was also to be decorated with his family members and demonstrates the growing tendency to include family members in the commemoration of these individuals.¹⁷⁹ Arches became an important symbol of imperial expansion and the power of Rome.¹⁸⁰ Yet these commemorative arches also highlight the increased importance of the entire family (including the female members), suggesting that the continued prosperity and security of the empire depended on the *domus Augusta* and not just the emperors.¹⁸¹ The arch in Rome was to be erected in the Circus Flaminius, near the statues dedicated to Divus Augustus and the *domus Augusta*, thereby connecting Germanicus with the whole imperial family through both the figures on the arch and the location itself.¹⁸²

The arch of Germanicus at the Rhine, although it only included a statue of Germanicus receiving the returned military standards, was situated near that of Drusus.¹⁸³ The rituals performed there were also linked to previous commemorative rituals to Drusus, further strengthening the family connections and uniting father and son through combined ritual practices. The *Tabula Siarensis* also mentions an arch in Syria that was to celebrate Germanicus's achievements, and a monument to Germanicus's eternal memory was to be erected in the Forum at Antioch, where he had been cremated, and a tribunal was to be set up at Daphne.¹⁸⁴ In all of these cases, Germanicus's life and achievements were celebrated with additional connections drawn between members of the imperial family.

The precedent for honors as well as the connection between members is made explicit throughout the surviving ancient evidence. Although these honors were predominantly based in Rome, the fact

that these *tabulae* were found in Italy and Spain suggests that notice of the honors granted to Germanicus was broadcast throughout the empire and that communities sought to demonstrate their loyalty and connections to this family by erecting copies of the honors granted by the Senate within their own communities. The arches served as permanent reminders of the deeds of this exemplary member of the imperial family, and the ritual actions allowed individuals living within the provinces to participate in the promotion and commemoration of the imperial house.

In addition to the honors granted to Germanicus immediately following his death, his memory continued to be celebrated well into the 3rd century. In the *Feriale Duranum*, a military calendar from the community of Dura-Europos, Germanicus's memory was celebrated with a *supplicatio* on the anniversary of his birthday.¹⁸⁵ This suggests that at least in the context of the army, the rituals associated with Germanicus's commemoration reinforced certain practices and ideologies, thereby uniting the army in the celebration of this exemplary member of the imperial family.¹⁸⁶

Germanicus's brother, Drusus, also received exceptional honors after his death in 23 CE. Tacitus states that the memorials for Drusus were the same as those for Germanicus, with some additions.¹⁸⁷ One of the major differences between Drusus's funeral and that of Germanicus is the procession of images (a feature that was absent from Germanicus's funeral).¹⁸⁸ This procession of images was the most elaborate to date and included Aeneas, Alban Kings, Romulus, Sabine nobles, and featured ancestors of both the Julian and Claudian families.¹⁸⁹ This procession highlights a number of the key individuals Augustus also used in his own "procession of ancestors" in the Forum of Augustus. The funeral procession's purpose may have been to showcase the ancestors of both the Julian and Claudian families, thereby promoting the reigning imperial family, and specifically Drusus's father, the emperor Tiberius.

An account of the honors granted to Drusus by the Senate survives in fragments coming from Rome and Spain.¹⁹⁰ The surviving inscriptions are very fragmentary but make reference to statues, some honors associated with the Lupercalia, a procession on the ides of July, and some honors concerning theaters. These honors are all modeled on those previously granted to other dead imperial princes, and in fact, much of the reconstruction of these fragments relies on the honors previously granted to Germanicus.¹⁹¹

In the honors granted to Gaius and Lucius in Pisa and those granted to Germanicus and Drusus after their deaths, promotion of the imperial family became an important part of imperial ideology. Even

for those individuals who were not officially deified, the honors granted to them, many of which were also celebrated in the provinces, drew a connection between provincial communities and the imperial family. These honors gradually developed and evolved over time, each set expanding on those granted previously. In each case, it was not only the individual who was commemorated but also the imperial family as a whole. Communities could then further expand on these honors. By establishing priesthoods to oversee the worship of the imperial family, individuals in particular communities could promote their own position and that of their family by drawing direct connections between themselves and the ruling house.

The Priests of Tiberius, Livia, and Germanicus in Lusitania

Three examples from Lusitania (discussed briefly in chapter 1) that refer to priesthoods being set up to living members of the imperial family. These inscriptions come from communities of various status—Augusta Emerita (*colonia* and provincial capital), Pax Iulia (*colonia*), and Olisipo (*municipium*)—and reflect the localized nature of cult.¹⁹² As discussed in chapter 1, although Tiberius rejected Further Spain's request for the establishment of a temple to Tiberius and Livia,¹⁹³ this did not prevent local communities in the provinces of Spain from establishing their own priesthoods to these individuals.

The first inscription, dating sometime between 14 and 19 CE, comes from the *municipium* of Olisipo.¹⁹⁴ The individual commemorated in this inscription, Quintus Julius Plotus, not only held some of the most important administrative offices in the community (aedile and *duovir*) but was also the priest of two cults to living members of the imperial family, Germanicus Caesar and Livia. There is no evidence that either of these individuals was specifically involved in the organization or development of this community. However, this community sought to draw connections with the imperial family by honoring these two living members of the imperial family with priesthoods held by members of the community's elite. These are two separate priesthoods, and although they were held by one individual, it is unclear whether he held both these priesthoods at the same time or at different times. The use of *inperpetum* seems to suggest that he held the priesthood of Livia for life (if not also that of Germanicus) and demonstrates that the worship of living members of the imperial family, including women, was an important aspect of religious practices in the communities of the provinces beginning immediately following Augustus's death.

In an inscription from Augusta Emerita, Gnaeus Cornelius Severus is

commemorated and holds the office of *flamen Iuliae Augustae*.¹⁹⁵ In this case, Livia is granted a priesthood, which may have only been held for a year since *inperpetuum* is not included, although there is still much scholarly debate about variations associated with these priestly titles and the length of office.¹⁹⁶ Similar to the priest from Olisipo, Gnaeus Cornelius Severus has also held the highest provincial office (*duovir*). This community not only served as the provincial capital of Lusitania but also hosted a provincial mint, which had its largest output of coins during Tiberius's reign.¹⁹⁷ Most of the coins promote Divus Augustus with a camp gateway, a temple or altar, and a direct reference to the name of the community. Although scholars have used these coins to argue for the presence of an altar or temple to Divus Augustus dating to this period, there is no surviving evidence for priests relating to this cult. This does not necessarily mean that no priests were established, but the surviving evidence regarding a priesthood of Livia only further secures the importance of the female members of the imperial family, especially the wife of the deified emperor, within these provincial communities. The connection between Livia and her divine husband is depicted on a number of coins. These coins are of a similar type to the Divus Augustus coins, dating to Tiberius's reign, and depict Livia with the camp gateway on the reverse; one coin depicts Livia seated on a throne.¹⁹⁸ This is one of only a few cases where a man held a priesthood of a female member of the imperial family: in most cases, the priests and the individual for whose cult they are responsible share the same gender.

A final inscription dating to the reign of Tiberius comes from Pax Iulia.¹⁹⁹ Marcus Aurelius was named *flamen Tiberii Caesaris*. As mentioned in chapter 1, this example demonstrates that even though, according to Tacitus, Tiberius rejected the request to establish cult to himself, Pax Iulia decided to establish a priesthood for Tiberius within its own community. In addition to the discussion of Tacitus's narrative in chapter 1, the discrepancy here could relate to the difference between provincial cult, which may have had some central control, and municipal cult, which appears to have been largely under local control. It is difficult to determine the motivation of the individuals responsible for establishing these priesthoods, especially since they were expressly rejected at the provincial level by the emperor himself. In any case, the ways in which communities established cult practices honoring the emperor and members of his family was diverse and relied on a number of factors.

In all of these three cases, the individuals holding these priesthoods also held the highest magisterial office and were highly influential and well-respected members of their particular communities. They were members of the governing body and may have played a role in the

community's decision to establish the worship of the imperial family. There is no evidence that the communities were directly approached by a member of the imperial family (as was the case with the altar at Lugdunum, established by Drusus in 12 BCE),²⁰⁰ nor is there any evidence of an embassy being sent, as was the case in the two examples for the attempted establishment of provincial cult discussed in chapter 1. Hopkins has argued that in the West, emperors themselves or their delegates played an important role in initiating and organizing the cult of the emperor.²⁰¹ However, this is not always the case. It appears that the decision to establish these priesthoods was up to the communities themselves and resulted from local initiative.

Although the limited surviving evidence from the early development of the worship of the imperial family makes it difficult to make broad statements about how communities made decisions about cultic establishments and priesthoods, nevertheless it is worth noting that honors dedicated to members of the imperial family other than the emperor played an important role in how imperial power was perceived and how communities sought to negotiate their own positions within the empire. The establishment of cult practices was based on the choice of particular communities and relied on adoption and adaptation of rituals that members of a community's elite considered best suited to their needs. Perhaps these elites believed that the best way to gain imperial favor was by connecting themselves with the living members of the imperial family.²⁰² Yet, according to the surviving literary sources, emperors are presented as being reluctant (or seeming to be reluctant) to receive divine honors during their own lifetimes.²⁰³ However, since there was no central control over local cult practices, these communities may have been acting of their own accord and did not sense the nuances and problems negotiating the establishment of the new entity in Roman politics—the imperial family. Instead, the local elites saw the establishment of local cult practices as a means by which to advance their own careers and increase the prestige of their communities.

Priests of Living Imperial Women

There were a number of priestesses dedicated to Livia during her lifetime in other provincial communities in addition to the priests of Livia from Lusitania. This demonstrates the active role of women within their communities through the imperial priesthood from the earliest stages of its development. Although the role of priestesses of deified individuals is the main focus of chapter 4, it is nevertheless worth examining some of these priesthoods that were attached to the

living female members of the imperial family within the context of this chapter's discussion.

In addition to the two male priests from Lusitania who were responsible for overseeing the cult of Livia during her lifetime, there are several examples of female priesthoods also dedicated to her cult.²⁰⁴ For the purposes of this discussion, the most notable priestess is Catia Servata in the community of Vasio in Narbonensis.²⁰⁵ Catia Servata was a *flaminica Iuliae Augustae Vasiensium Vocontiorum*. In her inscription (set up by her brother and heir, Catius Severus *ex testamento*), she is commemorated with her husband, Quintus Secundius Zmaragdus, whose position as *sevir Augustalis* is also promoted. Although the inscription gives no insight into her responsibilities as priestess, her connection to a *sevir Augustalis* may hint at one of the possible motivations for the establishment of the various offices associated with the worship of the imperial family.

Priesthoods had certain responsibilities not only relating to cult practices but also relating to benefactions made to the community. Women could not hold political office, so the granting of a priesthood helped draw connections between particular members of the imperial family and a community but also helped individuals outside the traditional political sphere to acquire their own prestige and influence. These priestesses could use their resources for the benefit of the community (through building programs, banquets, games, and other benefactions) similar to the philanthropy of the women of the imperial family (discussed further in chapter 4). They are also acting in a similar way to the male office of *Augustalis*, *sevir Augustalis*, or *sevir*.²⁰⁶ An office held predominantly by freedmen and only in communities in the provinces, an *Augustalis* (and the various other titles used) was able to promote his own status, offer benefactions to his community, and gain symbolic capital, even though the traditional political offices were not available to him (discussed further in chapter 5).²⁰⁷ Both Catia Servata and Quintus Secundius Zmaragdus had some connection with worship of the imperial family, and Catius Severus helped promote his family through the commemoration of his sister and her husband, thereby promoting both his own and their social standings.

A funerary inscription from Lugdunum in Lugdunensis commemorates Julia Helias, a *flaminica Augustae*.²⁰⁸ Her inscription describes her as child of Sextus Julius Callistus and Julia Nices and says that her siblings, Julia Heliane and Julia Callistate, were responsible for carrying her from the city and placing her in a sarcophagus and into a mausoleum. The family nature of this commemoration appears to be the most important part of the

inscription. In this case, Julia Helias's whole family is commemorated through their connection with priestess and their pious actions toward her body after her death. Nothing is known of her actions or responsibilities as priestess, but this position appears to have granted her some status, which could then be shared and promoted by the rest of her family.

These priesthoods likely came with some kind of status within the community, but what was the exact nature of the connection between these women and the female members of the imperial family—in this case, specifically Livia?²⁰⁹ Among the ancient literary sources' negative portrayal of Livia is some evidence for her beneficial acts and philanthropy. Velleius Paterculus presents Livia as using her power and position only for beneficial purposes.²¹⁰ In the senatorial decree against Cnaeus Piso, the Senate explicitly thanks her for her generosity toward men of all social ranks.²¹¹ In fact, the widow of Piso, Plancina, was granted clemency as a result of Livia's intervention.²¹² It could be that by establishing honors to Livia, the community sought to forge a connection with her in hopes of receiving her protection and benefactions in return.

Two other Julio-Claudian women were also honored with priesthoods in provincial communities during their lifetimes. A priestess to Antonia (mother of Germanicus and Claudius) is attested from the community of Ruscino in Narbonensis.²¹³ This priestess, Valeria, daughter of Quintus, appears to come from the same family as Gaius Valerius Paetus, a *flamen* of the *colonia*, one of the variations on the title for municipal priests responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family as a collective within a particular community.²¹⁴ The importance of particular families within a given community seems to have had some bearing on the political and religious positions held within those communities, and holding one of the priesthoods devoted to the imperial cult might have helped other members of a family gain positions of prestige. This family connection at the local level was mirrored at the imperial level. Antonia played an important role in the imperial family, not only through her instrumental role in the fall of Sejanus²¹⁵ but also through the use of her wealth and landholdings for numerous benefactions. She was, like most of the female members of the family, an important part of the dynastic structure as mother of Germanicus and Claudius and grandmother of Caligula.

Another important dynastic figure, Agrippina the Younger, was honored in a similar way. Although slightly beyond the geographical limits of this study, Crittia Priscilla was the *flaminica Agrippinae* in the community of Aeclanum in Italy.²¹⁶ This funerary monument also commemorates Crittia Priscilla's father, Publius Crittius Firmus, and

brother, also Publius Crittius Firmus. Her father held a number of important military offices (he was *primopilaris* of the Twenty-Second Legion and *praefectus castrorum* of the Twelfth Legion) and was *flamen divi Augusti*. The two priesthoods held by this family might suggest the importance of family connections or at least the importance of priesthoods being held by individuals of a particular status within a given community. Her father's position as *flamen* might have led Crittia Priscilla to receive this new priesthood of the living empress. Unfortunately the inscription breaks off after the name of her brother, so it is unclear whether he also held some priesthood related to the worship of the imperial family.

Why then, would this family (and this community) seek to connect themselves with the living empress when one of the family members was already a priest of Divus Augustus? Agrippina's position as wife of the emperor was important not only in Rome but also in the provinces. She was known for her provincial clients and even obtained colonial status for Ara Ubiorum, the community in which she was born.²¹⁷ Agrippina was also honored as priestess of Divus Claudius after her husband's death, and her benefactions and role in the cult of her husband may have led her to serve as a model for the honors granted to influential women in their own provincial communities.²¹⁸ The female members of the imperial family may have served as figures that the priestesses in the provinces sought to emulate; alternatively, by granting priesthoods for these imperial women, provincial communities may have sought to connect themselves to some influential members of the imperial family in hopes of receiving their patronage and benefactions in return. However, the fragmentary nature of the surviving evidence makes it difficult to reconstruct the nature of the cult paid to these living individuals or the positions of the priestesses within their own communities. Slightly more evidence regarding these connections survives for those female members of the imperial family who were deified (discussed in chapter 4).

Priests of Living Emperors

A number of emperors were granted priesthoods and were worshipped during their lifetimes. This did not only occur in the provinces but also in Italy.²¹⁹ The individuals responsible for setting up dedications were not only citizens but in some cases senators, further contradicting the Cassius Dio passage cited at the beginning of this chapter.²²⁰ Many of the dedications are statues, and it is difficult to distinguish between honorific statues and statues erected to serve some religious purpose (such as cult statues). In fact, the lines between these two types may have been blurred even during the

imperial period.²²¹ To (arbitrarily) simplify matters, instead of taking into consideration all honorific dedications, sacrifices and dedications made *pro salute imperatoris*, or dedications to the emperor's *numen* or *genius*, this discussion focuses on priests of living emperors, following and expanding on the earlier case study of the priests in Lusitania dedicated to overseeing the worship of the living members of the imperial family.

In Pompeii, Marcus Holconius Celer received the title *Augusti sacerdos* during Augustus's lifetime and then became a *sacerdos divi Augusti* after his death.²²² This is the only example in Italy (from the surviving evidence) of the use of *sacerdos* as the title for priests of the imperial family, and the title may reflect the fact that this individual appears to have been responsible for the worship of the living emperor.²²³ This example has been used to demonstrate that most of the priests in Italy would have first been responsible for overseeing the worship of the living emperor and that their titles would then change to reflect the newly deified status of the emperor after his death.²²⁴ However, as this is the only example of a shift in titles and of the use of the title *sacerdos*, this may be an exception rather than the norm. Gradel provides an excellent discussion of the priests of living emperors in Italy, and there is no need for further discussion of this material here.

Another early example of a priest of Augustus during his lifetime dates to 9–8 BCE. A bilingual inscription in Latin and Neo-Punic outlines the dedication of a market building from Lepcis Magna.²²⁵ The inscription marks the dedication of this market building by Annobal Tapapius Rufus (*de sua pequ[nia] faciun[dum coe]ravit idem[que] de[d]icavit*). The inscription mentions two local priests (*flamines Augusti Caesaris*), Iddibal Pilo, son of Aris, and Ammicar, son of Annobal.²²⁶ The local nature of this dedication and the individuals responsible for it is extremely pronounced except for one component.²²⁷ The Latin text provides the date of the inscription by the naming of individuals who held particular offices in this community: the proconsul and patron (Marcus Licinius Crassus Frugi),²²⁸ two *flamines* of Augustus whose names are incomplete, and the *sufetes*, whose names are also incomplete. The Italian style of the building itself suggests at least some Roman influence on the project. However, it appears that the initiative was local, as Annobal Tapapius Rufus built this building with his own money and dedicated it. The inclusion in the dating formula of two priests of Augustus Caesar, also clearly local based on the fragmentary remains of their names (one of whom was likely Annobal's son), suggest the promotion of individuals holding positions of influence within the community generally and links this building to Augustus with those who held priesthoods

dedicated to him.

An inscription from Baeterrae promotes a *flamen Augusti* who was likely also the first individual in this community to receive this title.²²⁹ This individual held a number of positions within the military, and his administrative position as the first *flamen Augusti* within this community is remarkable, as in many cases, priesthoods dedicated to the imperial cult are generally held after a number of other municipal offices.²³⁰ The title *flamen primum* is found in an inscription from the neighboring community of Narbo and has been interpreted as also referring to the first instance of this priesthood in this community.²³¹ Alternatively, this designation could refer to the first of two *flamines* (as the designation *bis* and *iterum* are also found in some titles of *flamines* throughout the empire).²³² Unfortunately the evidence for these titles is too fragmentary to determine the exact meaning of these additions, but at this early stage in the development of cult practices, it seems likely that individuals would choose to promote the first individuals to hold these priesthoods.

In the Spanish provinces, there are several early attestations of the title of a priesthood that is not attested elsewhere. As chapter 3 discusses, the most common titles for priests associated with the imperial cult at the municipal level are *flamen* and *sacerdos*. However, in two separate communities we have the title *pontifex Caesaris* (or *Caesarum*). In an unknown *oppidum* in Tarraconensis, Gaius Cornelius Vetulus is commemorated with an inscription by his wife, Cornelia, after his death. This inscription refers to Cornelius Vetulus as *pontifex Caesaris primus*. The *primus* suggests that he is the first individual to hold this priesthood. The inscription dates to 14–37 CE suggesting that this is a priesthood dedicated to the worship of the living emperor since there are examples of priests of Divus Augustus by this date. Alternatively, this priesthood could be dedicated to Germanicus or another imperial prince designated as Tiberius's successor as seems to be the case in Baetica discussed subsequently. The inscription does not include any details of his responsibilities, but the difference from the conventional titles being represented in other communities suggests that the community established this priesthood through local initiative.

In the neighboring province of Baetica, two dedications were made by Marcus Cornelius Proculus in the community of Anticaria: the first to Livia (Julia Augusta), the other to Germanicus.²³³ Both dedications refer to Marcus Cornelius Proculus as *pontifex Caesarum*. Although this term suggests that this priest was responsible for overseeing the worship of the members of the imperial family as a collective and thus

is beyond the scope of this discussion, this title reflects the localized nature of the early establishment of imperial cult practices and the importance of the worship of nondeified members of the imperial family during the earliest development of these religious rituals at a local level in the provinces.²³⁴ The dedication itself stresses the importance of family, praising Livia for her position as mother of Tiberius and Drusus (the Elder) and even as mother of the whole world. Even though Drusus had died in 9 BCE, his memory continued to play an important part in the construction of the imperial family.²³⁵ His dedication to Germanicus traces Germanicus's ancestry back to Divus Julius and promotes all of the offices held by him, including his position as *flamen* of Augustus. As mentioned previously, this priesthood was granted to Germanicus after Augustus's deification (so his office should be *flamen divi Augusti*) and was then passed on to his brother, Drusus, after Germanicus's death in 19 CE.

Another *pontufex Caesarum* is also attested in this community. Cornelius Bassus set up a dedication, with his own money, to Drusus the Younger.²³⁶ Drusus the Younger's titles are included in this inscription, and his divine ancestry is highlighted (*divi Augusti filius, divi Iuli pronepos*), as are the various positions he held, including the office of *pontifex* (spelled *pontufex*). This links the office held by the member of the imperial family with the office of the priesthood responsible for overseeing his worship. The spelling appears to be a regional variation, as is noted from the use of *pontufex* as both the office held by Drusus in Rome (as part of the pontifical college) and the local priesthood associated with the imperial cult.

In addition to the priest of Tiberius found in Lusitania, there are several other examples of priests of Tiberius found throughout the empire. In Lepcis Magna, Marcus Fulvius Saturnius was a *flamen Tiberi Caesaris Augusti*.²³⁷ He made some kind of a dedication (*dono dedit*), and the inscription was found lying near the south wall of the temple of Roma and Augustus, although it is unclear what the dedication was. Although formally dedicated to Roma and Augustus, in many cases, this type of temple served as the focal point for the worship of the imperial family. Moreover, there are some cases where temples were established to specific individuals (discussed in chapter 3), but in general, most communities could afford to establish only one temple, which then housed all the *divi* and *divae*. This is similar to the establishment of individual priesthoods. The ability for communities to establish separate *flamines* for individual *divi/divae* was a luxury only the wealthy cities could afford.²³⁸ However, this did not always prevent communities from forging connections with specific individuals, and in many cases, it is difficult to determine how long these individual cult sites were maintained.

An inscription found near the Capitolium in Thugga, Africa Proconsularis, states that Marcus Licinius restored a shrine to Tiberius.²³⁹ The inscription celebrates the fact that Licinius is responsible for restoring the shrine (*restituit aedem*) and decorated the spoiled statues (*statuas corruptas exornavit*). This inscription was found in three parts near the Capitolium, suggesting that the shrine occupied a central part of the landscape of the community. Licinius is also called *patronus pagi* in the inscription, which suggests that this benefaction may be only one part of a larger program of benefaction to the entire area. Although he was not a priest dedicated to the worship of the imperial cult, this individual still sought to connect himself with the imperial family and by restoring this shrine sought to promote himself through benefaction and a connection to the worship of the imperial family. This is another case of local (or at least localized) initiative, since this individual built this shrine to Tiberius in spite of Tiberius's decision to reject the request of the delegation from Further Spain.²⁴⁰

In some cases, priests of multiple individuals include the living emperor and one or more deified individuals. Although technically outside of the geographical scope of this study, an unknown person from Colonia Iulia Parium holds multiple priesthoods of this type. His title, *sacerdos imp(eratoris) Nervae item divi Titi*, demonstrates that he was responsible for overseeing the worship of the living emperor in this community as well as that of someone deified approximately fifteen years earlier. This title demonstrates that at least in some sense, the worship of the living emperor may have been included in some practices associated with the worship of deified members of his family and that the priests of these individuals may have also overseen the collective worship of the imperial family.²⁴¹

The worship of living and nondeified individuals was most pronounced during the earliest stages of the development of practices relating to the worship of the emperor and his family members. This is most likely a result of a community's attempts to connect itself with the ruling family and negotiate the new system of power. To make this connection, many communities looked to their neighbors for the terminology associated with these priesthoods, resulting in local and regional variations in titles, such as *pontifex/pontufex* in Baetica. As more individuals were deified, there became less focus on establishing priesthoods to living individuals, but dedications were still made (such as the *pro salute imperatoris* dedications). However, these dedications became the responsibilities of priests of particular *divi/divae* or even private individuals. Similar to the ways in which the honors associated with deification and other exceptional honors developed, the ways in which communities and individuals within those communities sought

to connect themselves with the emperor and his family continued to evolve and expand over time.

Chapter 3

Divi in the Provinces

Priesthoods, Honors, and Sacred Space

What little is known about the priests responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family in the Latin West comes from epigraphic sources, many of which are funerary monuments that include only the name and title of the individual. For this reason, scholars have attempted to illuminate the nature of these priesthoods by using comparative methods, either by using republican literary sources describing how priests were appointed, their responsibilities, and the various types²⁴² or by reconstructing fragmentary inscriptions such as the *Lex de Flamonio Provinciae Narbonensis* using literary accounts describing the office of the *flamen Dialis*.²⁴³ Although this *lex* refers to the provincial priests of Narbonensis, it nevertheless serves as an excellent reminder of the problematic nature of any attempt at the reconstruction of cult practices in the provincial communities. It has been argued that this inscription may be part of the establishment of the provincial cult of the imperial family in the province of Narbonensis by the Emperor Vespasian.²⁴⁴ This suggests at least some central involvement in the establishment of provincial cult, a phenomenon that has also been documented for the Spanish provinces following on the precedent set by Asia (see chapter 1).

Only thirty fragmentary lines of the *Lex de Flamonio Provinciae Narbonensis* survive, but it is clear that at least this part of the inscription seems to be concerned with the position of the provincial *flamen* within his community. These lines encompass the portions of five clauses.²⁴⁵ The first, lines 1–8, is concerned with the honors and privileges of the *flamen* during his year in office. The second, lines 9–16, refers to the honors and privileges given to ex-*flamen*. The third, lines 17–21, refers to a replacement for the regular *flamen*. The fourth, lines 22–24, discusses the meeting place for the provincial assembly. The fifth, lines 25–30, is concerned with public money and the *flamen*'s accountability. The fact that there is little other surviving evidence for the nature of the provincial cult increases the importance of this inscription.

Although this *lex* appears to focus on the provincial priests, it has been used as a model for discussions of all types of priests of the

imperial family in the provinces. The most pronounced example of complications associated with its use comes from discussions of the office of *flaminica*, which, according to many reconstructions, is an office granted to the wife of a *flamen*. This has led to a misunderstanding of the nature of this priesthood and the status of those who held it.²⁴⁶ The office of the *flaminica* and the problems associated with interpreting this office in the context of this inscription are discussed further in chapter 4.

No similar *lex* survives for outlining the functions of municipal priests. Municipal priests were established by the communities themselves, leading to increased variation in the titles and positions held by these individuals. However, the *lex Ursonensis* provides some insight into how local cults generally were established within a particular community.²⁴⁷ Chapter 64 outlines how the dates of religious festivals and sacrifices should be fixed.²⁴⁸ It was the responsibility of the *duoviri* to report to the *decuriones* which and how many days would be festivals and which sacrifices would be performed publicly and who would perform them.²⁴⁹ Although this passage does not specifically refer to the worship of the imperial family, one can assume that the sacrifices and festivals for these deities would be organized and planned in a similar way. Religion was a crucial part of the organization of the community and was constantly changing as new gods were adopted and rituals for the birthdays of imperial family members were added. In addition, the local public calendar was fixed by the local authorities each year and could be modified.²⁵⁰ This means that this charter allowed for both local initiative and change over time.²⁵¹

The lack of evidence regarding the roles and exact function of priests within their communities does not prevent us from discussing the importance of the priesthood and how cult spread throughout the empire. One of the most common titles for municipal priests is *flamen* or *flamen perpetuus*, with no other qualifier. Although this title demonstrates that there was a priest dedicated to overseeing the imperial cult in his community, the title does not draw a connection with one particular deified individual. A similar issue arises in the use of titles such as *flamen Augustorum*, which also reflect the worship of the imperial family as a collective rather than as individuals. However, some of the priestly titles are directly connected to one particular deified individual (such as Gaius Cornelius Minicianus, who was a *flamen divi Claudii* and a *flamen divi Traiani*)²⁵² or to the community or communities in which they held their priesthood (such as Marcus Cominius Aemilianus, a *flamen coloniae augustae Nemausis*).²⁵³ In some cases, references to cult centers are included either in the titles themselves or in dedicatory inscriptions.²⁵⁴ For this

reason, one can trace which of the deified individuals received cult outside of Rome and which connections were drawn between individuals, communities, and members of the imperial family.

In chapter 2, I argue that certain female figures in the empire and the priestesses set up to those figures during their lifetimes might be following the philanthropic model set by the empresses themselves not only to honor the empress but also to increase the priestesses' own prestige (and that of their families). A similar argument can be made for priests. Augustus set an example of benefaction that was then followed by many of the elites in Italy and in the provinces,²⁵⁵ many of whom also served as his priests (or as priests of other emperors). Local elites could gain symbolic capital, legitimize their own positions and those of their families within the community, and honor the imperial family through their actions as priests both in sacrifice (and other rituals) and in building projects.

***Sacerdos* or *Flamen*: The Municipal Priesthood**

The two most common titles given to both the provincial and municipal priests were *flamen* and *sacerdos*, with these titles found at both the provincial and municipal levels.²⁵⁶ A number of theories have been used to account for this. Hemelrijk discusses these fully, so they are only summarized here.²⁵⁷ These theories include: a chronological development from *sacerdos* to *flamen*, or vice versa; the titles depending on different degrees of "Romanization"; the types of buildings associated with the provincial cult center (*sacerdos* for an altar, *flamen* for a temple); and the difference reflecting the cult of the living ruler (*sacerdos*) and the cult of the *divi* (*flamen*).²⁵⁸ Within the context of priests of deified members of the imperial family in the specific provinces included in this study, the title appears to be exclusively *flamen*, except in a couple of cases where the priest is referred to as *pontifex divi Augusti*.²⁵⁹ However, these inscriptions date to the period immediately following the deification of Augustus and, as discussed in chapter 2, this was the period where the most common title in the province of Baetica for priests dedicated to the worship of the imperial family was *pontifex* (or *pontufex*), suggesting a local convention for priestly titles during this early period of development. The only other priesthood dedicated to a *divus* from Baetica after the reign of Tiberius comes from the community of Italica, where Marcus Cassius Caecilianus is referred to as *flamen perpetuus divi Traiani*.²⁶⁰ This change in titles may suggest that this province was later influenced by the surrounding communities in choosing the title for priests of the imperial cult.²⁶¹

Regardless of the various interpretations, there appears to be a wide

variety of titles given to individuals responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family. In Tres Galliae, the most common title is either *sacerdos* or *flamen Romae et Augusti*. The use of *sacerdos* for the municipal cults as well as the provincial cults in this province makes distinguishing between these two priesthoods difficult at times, especially if an inscription is fragmentary and the qualifier is missing.²⁶² However, a number of other titles are associated with the municipal cult, including *flamen Augusti munerarius*, *pontifex*, *flamen divorum*, *flamen perpetuus*, and *flamen Augustalis*. This variation continues throughout the 2nd century, suggesting that there is no central control over the municipal priestly offices and perhaps that the communities themselves determined which title to use.

The municipal priests in Narbonensis use the title *flamen*, which is qualified in a variety of ways, including *flamen Romae et divi Augusti* and *flamines* connected to a particular community (such as *flamen coloniae augustae Nemausis* and *flamen in colonia equestre vikanis Genavensibus*).²⁶³ There are also two examples of spelling variations in the titles, with a *flamon* (from Alba Helvorum)²⁶⁴ and a *flaminicus* (from Seduni).²⁶⁵ A few of these priesthoods were dedicated to named individuals of the imperial family along with Divus Augustus. As discussed in chapter 2, two priests in this province were responsible for overseeing the worship of Divus Augustus, along with both Drusus and Germanicus in one case and just Germanicus in the other.²⁶⁶ The connection between deified individuals and living members of their families was an important part of the early development of the imperial cult and persisted throughout the imperial period.

There are more surviving examples of inscriptions referring to municipal priests from the Spanish provinces than from Gaul, and these examples also show more variation in the titles granted to these priests. In Tarraconensis, there is one example of the title *pontifex* being used, but the rest of the municipal priests use the title *flamen*.²⁶⁷ Unfortunately, the most common title is *flamen* with no qualifier, which makes it difficult to determine the nature of this priesthood. When *flamen* does have a qualifier, it is commonly *Romae et Augusti*, *divorum et Augustorum*, or *Romae divorum et Augustorum*. This follows a similar pattern to other provinces and suggests that the imperial family and their deified ancestors were most commonly worshipped together. There are also five priests dedicated to the worship of *divi* as individuals, all from the community of Tarraco (discussed later in the chapter). The province of Lusitania was discussed in detail in chapter 2, as there were several priests dedicated to overseeing the worship of living members of the imperial family. Similar to the provinces already mentioned, the more common title for municipal priests is either *flamen divorum* or *flamen* qualified by the name of the particular

community in which he served. There are only two examples of a *flamen* dedicated to the worship of an individual, and in both cases the priests are responsible for overseeing the worship of Divus Augustus.²⁶⁸

The surviving evidence from Baetica shows the most variation in priestly titles from this region. In this province, both *pontifex* and *flamen* are used for municipal priests, and *pontifex* is qualified in a number of ways. There are examples of *pontifex domus Augusta*,²⁶⁹ *pontifex perpetuus divorum et Augustorum*,²⁷⁰ *pontifex* qualified with the name of the community,²⁷¹ and *pontifex* of a deified individual,²⁷² in addition to the two individuals with the title *pontifex Caesarum* discussed in chapter 2. The earliest surviving evidence appears to have spread first through the *municipia* and then to the *coloniae*, which may account for the difference in these titles.²⁷³ There are only four examples of priests dedicated to the worship of one *divus*, two with the title *flamen* and two with the title *pontifex*. Three of these priests were dedicated to the worship of Divus Augustus, while the other was dedicated to Divus Trajan.²⁷⁴ The inscriptions commemorating the two *pontifices divi Augusti* and the *flamen divi Augusti* all date to the reign of Tiberius and demonstrate the local variations associated with the early establishment of priests of the imperial cult in the western provinces. The priest of Divus Trajan comes from the community of Italica, and since both Trajan and Hadrian came from Italica and Hadrian granted this community the status of *colonia*, it is likely that this community sought to connect itself with the emperors.²⁷⁵

There are twelve attestations of municipal priests in the provinces of Mauretania, although none of these titles are qualified by an individual *divus*. Instead, most of the priests are called *flamen Augusti* or *flamen Augustorum*, and almost all date to the 2nd or 3rd century CE. Although it has been suggested that King Juba II played an important role in the development of cult at the local level, most of the surviving epigraphic evidence dates from the later period, making it difficult to determine the nature of the early development of these cult practices.²⁷⁶ In fact, the persistence of cult practices paid to the imperial family as a collective suggests that even though the original establishment may have resulted from influence from Rome (through a client king), communities chose to continue investing their own resources to make connections between themselves and the imperial family.

The greatest number of inscriptions referring to municipal priests in the empire comes from Africa Proconsularis (187 attestations); however, this province has the most surviving inscriptions in general, so this province did not necessarily establish more priesthoods than

other provinces but may have been more likely to commemorate those priests with dedications, funerary monuments, and statues.²⁷⁷ The titles of municipal priests tend to fall into three categories: those with the title *flamen Augusti perpetuus* (or in some cases *flamen Augusti* or *flamen perpetuus*), *flamen* of a particular community, and *flamen* of an individual *divus*. The most common title for priests in this province is *flamen perpetuus*. This title is extremely problematic for a number of reasons. The absence of a qualifier means that it is sometimes difficult to determine whether this priesthood was involved in the worship of the imperial family.²⁷⁸ In a number of cases, the individual with this title is recorded offering sacrifice *pro salute imperatoris* or to a deified individual or collection of individuals. However, there are also examples of this title being used to describe priests of other gods, and these priests were responsible for setting up dedications to gods to whom they were not directly connected, suggesting some overlap in these individuals' religious functions.²⁷⁹ In any case, the widespread evidence of this title throughout the province and the fact that the true nature of this title is unclear makes the study of these titles problematic. Because of the volume of inscriptions relating to the worship of individual *divi*, the inscriptions from this province will serve as the focus of the discussion on priests of individual *divi*.

After the province of Numidia was created out of territory taken from Africa Proconsularis by Septimius Severus, a number of municipal priests remained dedicated to the worship of the imperial family. The individual *divi* who receive priests were Septimius Severus and Caracalla, unsurprisingly considering the Severans' connection to this area. The more common title for municipal priests was *flamen perpetuus*, which was also the most common title in Africa Proconsularis and seems to continue to follow the general pattern of titles found in this area when it was still part of Africa Proconsularis.

The titles associated with the priesthoods in each province can be summarized as shown in table 1. Although there are a number of examples of priests being responsible for the worship of the *divi* as a collective, what is more telling is the priests who were dedicated to overseeing the worship of particular individuals within their communities. Through a study of their titles, one can trace how communities sought to connect themselves with particular emperors and other members of their family, how communities established cult practices, and how long the worship of particular individuals persisted after their deifications. Although the extant evidence rarely includes information other than the name of the priest and his title, this information still provides the best evidence for the widespread and variant nature of the practices associated with the worship of the *divi/divae*.

Table 1. Summary of Titles of Provincial and Municipal Priests			
	Title of Provincial Priests	Title of Municipal Priests	Notable Variations in Municipal Cult Titles
THE GAULS			
	flamon ensis		<i>flamon</i> <i>flaminicus</i>
	flamon Galliae		
THE SPAINS			
	flamon onensis		<i>pontifex</i> <i>caesar[um]</i>
	flamon ia		
	flamon		<i>pontufex</i> <i>pontifex</i>
NORTH AFRICA			
	flamon Byzacensis		<i>flamen</i>
	flamon idia		<i>flamon</i>
	<i>flamen</i>		

Priests of Individual *Divi*

Due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence, there are very few cases where there is surviving evidence of multiple priesthoods existing in any given community. Instead, the evidence largely consists of one or two inscriptions mentioning priests scattered among a few communities within a given province. In some cases, such as Tres Galliae and the Mauretaniae, there is no surviving evidence of priests of individual *divi* at the municipal level. Table 2 outlines the number of inscriptions relating to the municipal cult by province as well as the number of priests dedicated to the worship of one particular individual. This table demonstrates that there are particular *divi* who were more likely to have priests dedicated to their worship.²⁸⁰ It also shows that two provinces, Tarraconensis and Africa Proconsularis, have the greatest number of attestations and the greatest number of individual *divi* receiving priesthoods so it is worth examining these two provinces in more detail.

As mentioned in chapter 1, the people of Spain had requested permission to build a temple to Augustus. The description of this event in Tacitus suggests that this temple was established as the focal point for the provincial cult to Divus Augustus, since the people of Spain rather than the community of Tarraco sent the embassy.²⁸¹ A number of inscriptions refer to priests dedicated to the provincial imperial cult (with the title *flamen provinciae Hispaniae Citerioris*), but the discussion of these priests is beyond the scope of this book. However, the three of the five municipal priests with titles directly connected to individual

divi were also members of the provincial priesthood. Although it is unclear whether these priesthoods were held for a year or for life, some connection seems to exist between these two offices. However, one must not push the connection too far. Each of these individuals also held some of the highest offices in the community, such as aedile, quaestor, or *duovir*. These individuals were clearly influential within this community, but from the inscriptions it is difficult to determine which offices were held first or which positions increased these individuals' social standing and thus led to other offices. These inscriptions are honorific, in one case decreed by the *ordo Tarraconensium*²⁸² and in another *ex decreto decurionum*.²⁸³ These individuals were being honored by the governing bodies of the province and community itself, which then promoted their status as important and influential members of this community. What is worth noting is that none of these individuals appear to be related, so it is unlikely, at least with this small sample size, that the municipal priesthood was monopolized by one or two particular families.

Table 2. Municipal Priests Dedicated to the Imperial Cult and to Individual <i>divi</i>			
Province	Municipal Priests	Priests of individuals	Divi who received priests
THE GAULS			
	Carbonensis		
	Aes Galliae		
THE SPAINS			
	Tarraconensis		
	Augustus		
	Augustus, Trajan		
NORTH AFRICA			
	Africa Proconsularis		
	Septimia		Severus, Caracalla
	02		

Priesthoods were not established for every *divus* as an individual within the provincial communities. An examination of those individuals who were the focus of a priesthood provides insight into the types of connections made between the communities and their emperors. In Tarraco there are priests (*flamines*) connected to Divus Augustus,²⁸⁴ Divus Claudius,²⁸⁵ Divus Vespanian,²⁸⁶ Divus Titus,²⁸⁷ and Divus Trajan.²⁸⁸ It is likely that each priesthood was established shortly after the death and deification of the emperor. For the priest of

Divus Vespasian, his position and actions within his community merited recognition from the emperor. This inscription records the fact that he was granted a public horse by the emperor Nerva.²⁸⁹ It is unclear from the inscription in what order he received his various positions and honors, and it is likely that he was first given the municipal priesthood, later received the public horse, and then went on to hold the provincial priesthood, thereby following the order in which these offices and honors were presented on the inscription.²⁹⁰

The community of Tarraco established a priesthood connected to each of the deified emperors, in turn, although it appears that the priesthoods did not persist after the first priest. Unfortunately, this finding could also be a result of the fragmentary surviving evidence rather than proof that this community was not continuing to worship individuals well after their deification. However, these priesthoods make a direct statement about the community's and its members' attempts to connect themselves with the emperor and his divine family. Since Tarraco was also the provincial capital, it is understandable and even expected that there would be some connection between the municipal and provincial cults. Individuals appear to hold the municipal priesthood first, and this position appears to lead to other positions within the community, culminating in the provincial priesthood.²⁹¹

Unlike in the case of Tarraco, where the priesthoods were granted shortly after the death and deification of the emperor, the evidence from Africa Proconsularis suggests that many of these *divi* were granted priesthoods years after their death and deification.²⁹² One of the most striking is a priesthood dedicated to the worship of Divus Julius found in the community of Rusicade.²⁹³ Gaius Caecilius Gallus was of equestrian status and likely originally came from the Gallic provinces.²⁹⁴ A funerary monument for his daughter lists her father as *flamen provinciae*, suggesting that he later achieved the provincial priesthood in Africa and that this served as the crowning achievement of his *cursus*.²⁹⁵ However, in the first inscription, the last item on an impressive list of offices is *flamen divi Iuli*. This inscription dates to sometime between 70–100 CE and demonstrates that Caesar was receiving priesthoods more than a century after his official deification in 42 BCE. Caesar's involvement in Africa may have some bearing on why this community would maintain a priesthood in his honor, and this priesthood might have been established sometime in the 40s BCE, when this area was under the control of one of Caesar's allies, but there is no surviving evidence mentioning this priesthood from this period.²⁹⁶ Even though this individual was the first to be deified in Rome, this is the only example of a priesthood dedicated to his worship outside of Italy, although this is unsurprising considering the

fact that *Divus Julius* is rarely included in later lists of *divi*.²⁹⁷

The individual *divus* most commonly worshipped well after his deification in these Western provinces is Titus.²⁹⁸ Most of the priesthoods dedicated to his worship date to the middle of the second century, which suggests that Titus continued to receive priesthoods after the death of the first generation of his priests. Vespasian was also worshipped as an individual well after his deification, and these priesthoods may be a direct result of Vespasian's involvement in the province during his time as governor during the reign of Nero.²⁹⁹ The continued importance of the Flavian *divi* should therefore not be surprising in this province. Priesthoods to Claudius and Nerva also persisted well after the deification of these individuals.³⁰⁰ The fact that these communities could afford to set up priesthoods to individuals demonstrated their commitment to establishing connections to these *divi*, promoting their resources and dedication. In some cases, a specific relationship may have existed between the community and that particular individual (discussed in chapter 2). The connections made by one particular community, Lepcis Magna, to various members of the imperial family are discussed later in the chapter. Individuals continued to play a role in the development and organization of cult practices to the imperial family, even during the later periods, when it was more common to worship the imperial family as a collective.

One of the later examples, from the region around Thunigaba (*pagus Thunigabensis*), commemorates an unknown individual who held several priesthoods: *flamen divi Antonini Pii*, *flamen divi Traiani*, and *flamen divi Magni Antonini*.³⁰¹ This inscription dates to 233 CE and demonstrates that a number of *divi* were worshipped as named individuals well after their official deification in Rome, even during the later periods. These three *divi* are separated by one hundred years (with Trajan deified in 118 CE and Caracalla in 218 CE). Nevertheless, these individual *divi* still received priests as individuals, although one priest was responsible for overseeing the cult practices associated with their worship.

In many communities, the priesthoods of members of the imperial family were the highest form of social advancement.³⁰² Although some individuals such as Publius Hedulus (discussed later in the chapter in relation to the shrine he built) sought to achieve this status of their own accord, the priests dedicated to overseeing the worship of the imperial family held a certain status within their communities. In most cases, these individuals had held other forms of municipal office, and in the case of the provinces of Gaul, the priesthood was held only after the individual had achieved the duumvirate.³⁰³ However, in

other communities, these priesthoods were part of the *cursus honorum* and led to greater positions of authority and prestige.³⁰⁴ In Africa as in other provinces, priesthoods may have been connected to particular forms of civic benefaction.³⁰⁵ In any case, although these priesthoods tended to be connected to a particular class of individuals within the community, the honor of becoming one of these priests led to higher office, such as a seat on the provincial council or even the office of provincial priest, responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family for the entire province. This progression of offices further enhanced the social capital of the individual and his family. As can be seen in Várhelyi's study, many first-generation provincial senators had ancestors who held offices associated with the worship of the imperial family.³⁰⁶

Some patterns emerge from the extant evidence, although a number of complications arise in a study of this kind. The extant evidence from each community is too fragmentary to determine whether these priesthoods were held by the same families or whether titles were hereditary. Within particular communities, some families had more wealth and influence than others, but it seems unlikely that the priesthoods were controlled by particular families. The inscriptions themselves rarely provide more information than just the name of priest and his title, so it is difficult to determine the nature of this offices and how these *divi* were specifically worshipped. In addition, so few inscriptions survive from each community that tracing change over time and analyzing the variety of titles is not possible. Despite these complications, however, a number of observations can be made.

First, Africa Proconsularis had a wide range of *divi* worshipped, and their worship continues well into the 3rd century CE. The other provinces tended to worship the same early *divi* but have significantly less surviving evidence. However, this may reflect the nature of excavations and other such factors rather than an absence of cults. Moreover, this reflects the overall trend of the epigraphic evidence and does not necessarily mean that this province was establishing more priesthoods than other provinces.³⁰⁷ Likewise, many of the provinces that lack surviving attestations of priests of members of the imperial family are provinces in which there are fewer inscriptions overall. Some provinces (such as the Mauretaniae and Tres Galliae) have no surviving evidence of priesthoods being set up to individual *divi*. Likewise, many of the provinces that have no surviving attestations of priests of members of the imperial family have fewer inscriptions as a whole. This lack of attestations to individual *divi* may result from the types of inscriptions that survive or the way in which the worship of the imperial family was established in these communities (i.e., were these communities more likely to worship the

imperial family as a collective rather than as named individuals).

Second, the *divus* who received the most priests as an individual was Augustus. Priests dedicated to Divus Augustus persist well into the 3rd century CE, leading to the question of whether Divus Augustus continued to be worshipped as an individual more than two hundred years after his deification or whether this title reflects a more general idea of deification—that is, could this title be referring to the most recently deified individual rather than to Augustus himself? If the latter is the case, it follows the general use of the title *Augustus* to denote the emperor himself and *Caesar* as that individual (or individuals) designated as successor. However, this may in fact refer to Augustus himself. It is likely that this is the case in light of the fact that all ancient lists of the *divi* begin with Augustus and that his position as the first *princeps* plays an important role in the legitimization of later dynasties as well.

Third, there is no surviving evidence of priesthoods being set up to male deified members of the imperial family who were not emperors. This is likely because most of those who were deified were, in those cases, children.³⁰⁸ The process of deifying the children of the emperor appears to serve as a type of *consolatio* for the imperial family, and although news of these new divinities was broadcast throughout the empire in a similar way to the other deifications, these *divi/divae* were rarely the focus of cult practices.³⁰⁹ One exception might be a dedication made to Trajan's biological father as *divus* from the community of Gigthis.³¹⁰ This dedication does not include any additional information about who made the dedication, and its fragmentary nature makes it difficult to determine whether it was dedicated to Trajan's father or to Divus Trajan (the deified emperor) himself. In any case, the decision to establish a priesthood to an individual *divus* appears to rely on a variety of factors, and because of the cost associated with these priestships, it appears that communities sought to connect themselves more commonly with the emperor himself or the influential female members of his family rather than his children.

Finally, there is no surviving evidence of priestships being set up to individual *divi* after Caracalla in provincial communities. Based on the surviving evidence, the last individual to receive a priesthood in Rome was Pertinax.³¹¹ Here, Pertinax's son received the responsibility of overseeing the worship of his divine father, much in the same way as many of the *flamines* of individuals in Rome were members of the imperial family.³¹² This does not mean that individuals were no longer being deified in Rome, as we have evidence of this practice continuing well into the 4th century CE; instead, these individuals no longer

received priests as individuals. It is possible that this reflects a shift in the focus of cult, and priests became responsible for overseeing the worship of all the *divi* rather than one specific *divus/diva*. In the case of the provinces, it appears that individuals such as Caracalla and Septimius Severus still had priests responsible for overseeing their worship as individuals even when these priesthoods did not exist (or evidence of their existence does not survive) in Rome.

There does not appear to be a “canonical” list of *divi* that spread throughout the provinces. Communities, mainly the elites within those communities, decided to whom to establish priesthoods, whether or not those individuals were officially deified. In many cases, deifications resulted when local elites (or client kings outside the boundaries of the empire) attempted to forge connections with the imperial family. The center imposed no standard cult practice on these communities. Terminology varied among communities, as can be seen in the titles *pontifex*, *sacerdos*, and *flamen* as well as inclusion of the cult center of a particular individual in the title. These communities and individuals within those communities sought to forge a connection between themselves and members of the imperial family by establishing these priesthoods with their own money and resources.

Altars and Sacred Space

Another means by which cult practices to members of the imperial family can be traced is through altars, temples, and other forms of sacred space. However, the identifications of sacred space dedicated to members of the imperial family at a local level are extremely problematic. This is in part due to the fact that in most cases, building dedications do not survive within the area of the archaeological remains. In addition, the limited archaeological excavations within some communities mean that many temples dedicated to the local worship of the imperial family have not yet been discovered, excavated, or published. Further, the presence of statues of emperors and members of their family does not prove that they were worshipped in these locations. Likewise, not all statues were cult statues. However, in some cases, references to temples, shrines, and altars survive in dedicatory inscriptions and literary sources even when their physical forms do not. Although I do not intend to provide a comprehensive catalog of all the sacred space dedicated to the *divi*, some examples merit detailed description.³¹³

One of the most comprehensive accounts of an altar dedicated to the imperial cult comes from Narbo in Narbonensis.³¹⁴ This altar was dedicated to the *numen Caesaris Aug(usti)* and although a discussion of the *numen* is beyond the scope of this study, it is worth briefly

discussing the establishment of this altar before turning to sacred space dedicated to the worship of the *divi*.³¹⁵ The altar was vowed in 11 CE and dedicated in 12–13 CE by the people of Narbo. The inscription on the right side of the altar gives particular details of the proper organization and practices associated with this cult, including regulations for the cleaning, decorating, and expanding of the altar as well as any sacrifices made on or gifts given to the altar. It then states that “other laws for this altar and inscriptions shall be the same as those are for the altar of Diana on the Aventine.”³¹⁶ According to the sources, the altar of Diana was established in the reign of Servius Tullius and was built as a shared venture between the Latins and the Romans, modeled on the shrine of Ephesian Diana.³¹⁷ Although the ancient sources describing the establishment of this altar clearly refer to Rome’s imperialistic aims, this does not necessarily imply that the altar at Narbo was established as a result of directives from the center. Instead, these ancient regulations served as an excellent model for the laws associated with cultic establishments elsewhere and could be seen as a way for communities to establish “Roman” rites.³¹⁸ Its location outside the *pomerium* and the fact that it was founded as an intercity cult may have ensured its continued use of the regulations for other cultic establishments serving similar functions.³¹⁹

The end of the inscription states that this altar (by the laws and limits established with this inscription) was set up on behalf of Augustus (*imperator Caesar Augustus*) and his wife (*coniunx*), children (*liberi*), and clan (*gens*), the Senate of the Roman people, and the citizens and inhabitants of Narbo in the hope that Augustus would be propitious to the community in return (*uti sies volens propitium*). This inscription states explicitly the expectation of the connection forged between the community and the whole imperial family through the establishment of cult, although in this case it is to the emperor’s *numen* rather than to a deified individual.

A variety of sources mention an early cult site dedicated to the worship of the imperial family in the western provinces in the form of an altar found in the municipal forum at Tarraco.³²⁰ This altar has been linked with Augustus’s stay in Tarraco in 26–25 BCE and is depicted on a coin from the beginning of the reign of Tiberius.³²¹ In connection with this altar, Quintilian presents an anecdote in which the inhabitants of Tarraco report that a palm has sprung up on the altar (a common motif on the coins depicting this altar).³²² Unfortunately, nothing survives of the forum area or its complement of temples in this community, so the exact nature of this altar is unclear. From this limited evidence, it appears as though this altar was set up to Augustus during his lifetime, but whether that dedication changed after his official deification or the altar became a

center for the collective worship of the imperial family is unknown.³²³

Many inscriptions refer to altars, but their fragmentary nature means that they usually only include the name of the dedicator or just the individual to whom it was dedicated.³²⁴ Yet it seems logical that altars were dedicated more often than temples purely from a resource standpoint, although smaller shrines also appear to be common, at least from the limited surviving evidence. These altars and shrines were sometimes set up to the living emperor or could include both living and deified members of the imperial family. Shrines and altars to living emperors appear to be most common during the earliest development of the cult practices, following the trend of the priests discussed in chapter 2. In the community of Thugga, Marcus Licinius set up a shrine to Tiberius during his lifetime that was later supplemented by an altar.³²⁵ Another dedication to Tiberius comes from the community of Avitina by Gaius Septumius Saturninus, a *flamen*, and dates to 33 CE.³²⁶ In Thugga, an altar was vowed to Divus Augustus and the emperor Claudius in 48 CE by Julius Venustus, a *flamen divi Augusti*.³²⁷ The inscription celebrates Venustus's whole family and includes the names and titles of his brothers, one of whom also was a *flamen divi Augusti*, another twice *sufes*. This family clearly held an important position in this community. His father, Faustus Thinoba, had a half-Libyan, half-Latin name, but each of the sons was given a Latin name, suggesting that the members of this family had begun to create a Roman identity for themselves. Venustus's wife was also likely a Roman citizen. This altar was then dedicated by Gaius Artorius Bassus, who was not only a patron of the *pagus* but also had an illustrious career in Carthage, where he held the offices of *pontifex*, *aedile*, and *duovir*. This altar demonstrates the ways in which individuals could promote themselves and their families to increase their status within their communities. It also highlights the way in which the focal points for the worship of both living and deified individuals were established. Although Julius Venustus was a *flamen divi Augusti*, he could also oversee aspects associated with the worship of the living emperor.

It seems likely that temples dedicated to the worship of the imperial family served as monumental focal points within the city, as seems to be the case for those that can be securely identified. Temples generally played an important role in the organization of the city and in many cases were linked to the central forum itself. The complications associated with tracing dedications are clearly reflected in the temple associated with the central forum at Augusta Emerita, which is commonly assumed by modern scholars to be a sanctuary for ruler worship.³²⁸ This temple was constructed during the first building projects of this colony (sometime in the last decade BCE) and is

commonly referred to by modern scholars as the Temple of Diana. Étienne argues that it may have been a temple dedicated to Augustus during his lifetime.³²⁹ However, the dedication of the temple from this period is uncertain, though a dedication, *Divo Antonino Pio Aug(usto)*, may belong to this temple and show that this temple was rededicated after the death of Antoninus Pius.³³⁰ Moreover, many portraits of members of the imperial family have been discovered in the vicinity, suggesting at some point, whether originally or at a later date, it was closely associated with the worship of the imperial family.³³¹ However, the presence of imperial statues does not prove that this temple was dedicated to the worship of the imperial family. If this temple were in fact dedicated to Augustus, as Étienne suggests, it seems odd that no evidence for a priesthood of Augustus dating from this period survives in this community. However, relatively few inscriptions survive from this period, so the absence of proof is not necessarily proof of absence. In any case, whether or not this temple was specifically associated with the worship of the imperial family, its central location and the inclusion of portraits of the emperors and members of their families demonstrates the active promotion of these individuals within the overall landscape of the city.

In addition to the city-sponsored cult sites and those funded and dedicated by influential members of the community, there is another aspect of the worship of the imperial family. In some cases, private individuals built private shrines that could then be used in an attempt to gain symbolic capital and expand their own influence. An altar and shrine from Carthage demonstrate this point. The shrine (*templum*) was dedicated to the *gens Augusta* by Publius Perelius Hedulus, a *sacerdos perpetuus*.³³² According to Rives, Hedulus was a freedman who had Augustus to thank for his rise to prosperity. This shrine and altar (which depicts a sacrifice, Aeneas fleeing Troy with Anchises and Ascanius, Apollo seated on a griffin, and Roma seated on a pile of military equipment) may therefore have been a way for this individual to thank his benefactor and increase his own social standing. The altar copies many of the Augustan monuments in Rome and many of the images propagated during Augustus's reign (his connection with Apollo after the Battle of Actium and his adoption of the griffin as his symbol are two such examples). His title is *sacerdos*, not *flamen*, suggesting that he may not have been granted this honor by the local *ordo* and may have set himself up as priest, since this title does not follow the title conventions in this province. Zanker points out that ambitious freedmen often attempted to rival the local elites by setting up monuments.³³³ At least in this instance, it is clear who was responsible for determining the imagery used on the monument and the establishment of the cult: a local individual, Publius Perelius

Hedulus.³³⁴ Both the altar from Carthage and the shrine and altar of Publius Perelius Hedulus are not directly tied to the worship of the *divi* but instead are tied to other aspects (*numen* and *gens Augusta*) of the worship of the imperial family; they thus demonstrate how cults of this type (i.e., cults responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family) were established but not how cult was set up for deified individuals of the imperial family.

The most common temple (or altar) to be set up throughout the empire was to Roma and Augustus or Divus Augustus (which may explain the number of priests who received this title in the West). However, these temples could be rededicated to other members of the imperial family (as is the case with the temple of Roma and Augustus at Vienne, which became a temple to Divus Augustus and Diva Augusta following their deifications).³³⁵ However, as more individuals were deified, temples rarely underwent more rededications. Instead, cult statues were added to the buildings, which retained their original dedications, suggesting that the temples became the center for the collective worship of these individuals rather than the worship of named individuals themselves.

The dedication of buildings, shrines, and altars to members of the imperial family highlights the important connection between the religious landscape in local communities and the wider Roman world. The allocation of resources to support these buildings came from local individuals, and they ultimately decided how those resources would be used. By establishing cult centers to specific individuals, these communities and their influential individuals sought to forge a connection with the emperor and his family. These religious benefactions not only benefited the city but also increased the social prestige of those responsible for their dedication. In some cases, governors and other senatorial officials set up cult centers in particular communities, but these actions were undertaken with the local priest.³³⁶ As more individuals were deified, space dedicated to particular individuals became less common, but the persistence of priests to individuals demonstrates the importance of forging relationships with specific members of the imperial family as well as the deified family as a whole.

Lepcis Magna: A Brief Case Study of Cult in One Community

Studies of priestly titles and sacred spaces in the provinces are problematic in part because of the limited surviving evidence and the fragmentary nature of that evidence. The distribution of this evidence complicates the matter further, as it is difficult to tell whether the

limited evidence in particular areas or communities is a result of survival rather than the lack of inscriptions and monuments erected. The community of Lepcis Magna not only has a number of priests dedicated to particular individuals that can be relatively securely dated but also has a number of priests dedicated to the collective worship of the imperial family as well as several temples with secure dedications linking them to the imperial cult. For this reason, this community serves as an excellent case study to examine how municipal practices were manifested within one community.

The earliest surviving evidence for a priest in this community dates to 9–8 BCE. As discussed in chapter 2, two local individuals were referred to as *flamines Augusti Caesaris*—that is, priests of the living emperor Augustus.³³⁷ Approximately forty-five years later, a priest was also established to the living emperor Tiberius.³³⁸ Two fragments commemorate Marcus Fulvius Saturnius, a *flamen Tiberi Caesaris Augusti*, who gave something as a gift (*dono dedit*). Although it is unclear what the gift was, each fragment was found in a temple—the first in the temple of Roma and Augustus, the second in the temple of Magna Mater—suggesting that these gifts served some kind of religious or architectural purpose for these two buildings.

There are also two priests dedicated to the worship of Augustus after his death and deification.³³⁹ In both cases, these individuals become priests well after Augustus's deification. This demonstrates the persistence of his cult well into the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE, a feature of the cult of Augustus that is rarely repeated in the cults of other *divi*. The first inscription, dating to 62 CE, although fragmentary, appears to be a dedication to Nero involving the erection of columns and includes all of Nero's titles and divine ancestry.³⁴⁰ Sabius Tapius, a *flamen divi Augusti*, was responsible for overseeing the erection of the columns (and apertures above them and other things that are unclear as the inscription becomes even more fragmentary at this point).

The project was dedicated by Servius Cornelius Orfitus, who had held a number of important positions in Rome, including the position of quaestor under the emperor Claudius, praetor, consul, *pontifex*, and *sodalis Augustalis*. This final position demonstrates his direct connection with the worship of the imperial family in Rome. His titles also include proconsul and *patronus*, suggesting that his involvement in this project was a result of his administrative position within this province and the community of Lepcis Magna in particular. Although he has direct connections to Rome, the project is undertaken by the local *flamen*, Sabinus Tapius. In any case, the dedication of this

portico to Nero promotes the emperor and his divine ancestry as well as the two individuals overseeing the project, both of whom hold positions responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family.

The second inscription commemorates Tiberius Julius Frontinus, was decreed by the entire city council (*universus ordo*), and was set up by his son at his own expense (*de suo posuit*). This inscription seems to suggest that Frontinus played an important role in the community. As the only office given in the inscription is his role as *flamen divi Augusti*, perhaps this honor resulted directly from his position as overseer of the cult of Divus Augustus. The inscription promotes his son, who, although the honor was decreed by the city council, was responsible for paying for and setting up the statue himself.

A rare example of a priest of Claudius also survives from this community.³⁴¹ During the reign of Trajan, Marcus Severus expanded some part of the greater basilica and the baths (the inscription becomes very fragmentary around this point). In any case, here we have a priest giving benefactions to his community through building projects, thereby promoting his own position and gaining symbolic capital for himself. It is also worth noting that this individual was a priest of Claudius more than fifty years after his official deification. The age of this priest is unknown, but it seems unlikely that he had received the title immediately following the death and deification of Claudius. Lepcis Magna clearly continued to promote its connection to this particular *divus* well after his deification.

The final two priests of an individual *divus* are both priests of Divus Vespasian. An inscription commemorates the fulfillment of a vow by Marcus Vipsanius Clemens.³⁴² The dedication is made to the gods of Lepcis Magna (*Dibus Lepcis Magnae*) by Marcus Vipsanius Clemens in fulfillment of a vow at his own expense (*de sua pecunia*) and is fulfilled under the administration of Quintus Servilius Candidus, a *flamen divi Vespasiani*. Unfortunately the inscription breaks off at this point, so the connection between these two individuals is unclear, but Quintus Servilius Candidus appears to have a very influential position within his community and is praised as lover of his country (*amator patriae*), lover of the citizens (*amator civium*), and adorer of his country (*ornator patriae*), a series of titles that are echoed in other inscriptions from this community.

Tiberius Claudius Sestius, a *flamen divi Vespasiani* who also appears to be a very influential individual within his community and who had received a number of honors, including the same series of titles as Quintus Servilius Candidus, set up an altar and statue base with his

own resources.³⁴³ Although it is unclear to whom the altar was dedicated and whose statue was erected, the inscription is dated through the list of Domitian's titles, thereby linking himself with the ruling emperor and the son of the *divus* whose priesthood he held. In addition, this individual was also a *flamen perpetuus*. Generally interpreted as the title for the collective worship of the imperial family at the local level in the provinces of Africa, *flamen perpetuus* is the most common priestly title in North Africa. In this case, the fact that Tiberius Claudius Sestius held both the priesthood of a particular individual and the priesthood responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family as a collective stresses the importance of both the collective worship of the imperial family and the ability of individuals and communities to link themselves directly to specific *divi*.³⁴⁴

A number of temples dedicated to members of the imperial family survive from the community of Lepcis Magna and can shed some light on the nature of the establishment of cult practices in this province.³⁴⁵ A temple of Roma and Augustus was set up ca. 14–19 CE and played an important role in the transformation of public space within this community.³⁴⁶ Its dedicatory inscription in Punic states that the temple was completed when Balyathon and Bodmelqart were *sufetes* (local magistrates) and that it contained statues of the members of the imperial family arranged in pairs: Augustus and Roma, Tiberius and Julia Augusta (Livia), Germanicus and Drusus, Agrippina (wife of Germanicus) and Livia (wife of Drusus), and Antonia (mother of Germanicus) and Agrippina (mother of Drusus).³⁴⁷ Two important conclusions can be drawn from this temple. First, the surviving inscription is in Punic, not in Latin, although it seems likely that there would be an accompanying Latin inscription. Second, this temple was dedicated to Roma and Augustus but included the statues of a number of members of the imperial family (as each of these pairs of individuals is mentioned in the dedicatory inscription). This suggests that from its earliest manifestation, in this community, the worship of the emperor included the worship of the family as a whole.³⁴⁸

Another small temple behind the theater has a dedication, *Dis Augustis*, that can be dated to 43 CE.³⁴⁹ This temple was built by a member of the local elite, Iddibal Tapaius, at his own expense (*de sua pecunia*) and follows a similar pattern to other dedicatory inscriptions within this community in that the dedication was made by a *patronus* who was member of two of the four main priestly colleges in Rome and held some of the highest magistracies in Rome, culminating in two proconsulships. However, this dedication formula seems to be

related to dedications made elsewhere to anonymous Augustan gods, which seem to collectively have connections to the imperial family and are largely included in *pro salute*-type inscriptions.³⁵⁰ This suggests that the temple was not dedicated to specific members of the imperial family or deified emperors but instead served as a more abstract collection of the divinities associated with the imperial family.

The temple of the Flavians originally consisted of two temples, first constructed between 77–78 CE and 93–94 CE. By 93–94 they became one temple that was then dedicated to Divus Vespasianus, Divus Titus, and Domitian.³⁵¹ Although it was common for the statues of living emperors to be found in temples dedicated to the *divi*, it was rare for a temple to be dedicated specifically to both deified and nondeified members of the imperial family. This temple and the importance of the connections drawn by individuals within Lepcis Magna to the Flavian family may also be related to the two priesthoods dedicated to the worship of Divus Vespasian mentioned earlier. However, the inscription is not complete, so it is not clear who was responsible for the construction. In contrast to the earlier temple to Roma and Augustus, this dedication was inscribed in Latin.

During the reign of Septimius Severus, a new monumental forum was constructed in the community. Although it was envisioned in the original project, the temple itself was not completed until after his death in 211 CE. No inscription survives, but Brouquier-Reddé suggests that it is likely that this was a temple to Septimius Severus and his family because of the location of the temple, Severus's role in monumentalizing the city, and the fact that this was the community in which he was born.³⁵² A fragment of an inscription (. . .]*onco*[. . .), survives, and Ward-Perkins suggests that it could be the dedication and could be reconstructed as *concordia*, since Concordia Augustorum was an important concept to which the Severan dynastic connected itself.³⁵³ These temples were not only the location of religious activity but also played a crucial role in promoting the ruling family and justifying its right to power. In this case, this temple was not set up on its own but was part of a larger project to monumentalize the city.

These temples and priesthoods within the community of Lepcis Magna highlight some important features of this cult. First, the imperial family was worshipped as a collective from its earliest establishment. These temples included both deified and nondeified members of the imperial family, and their establishment allowed individuals within the community to connect themselves with the emperor and his divine family as well as to promote the individuals' status within their communities. Second, temples dedicated to the worship of the imperial family played an important role in the

landscape of the community, serving as a focal point around which the community could gather. Finally, priesthoods and cult centers were established by local elites. This is made especially apparent through the use of Neo-Punic in many of the inscriptions and the many Punic names of the priests and those responsible for the cult buildings. The municipal cult fell under the jurisdiction of the community itself, and the local elites determined in what form the cult would manifest.

Chapter 4

Female Divinities

The *Divae* and Their Priests

Sixteen women were officially deified in Rome.³⁵⁴ Although most were the wives of emperors, this group of deified women also included daughters, nieces, aunts, and sisters. The fact that many of these women were the recipients of cult in the provinces highlights the importance of the entire imperial family, and not just the emperor, in imperial cult practices.³⁵⁵ It is even more telling that although there is no epigraphic evidence for priestesses of the *divae* in Rome,³⁵⁶ a number of communities throughout the empire established priesthoods for these *divae*, both as individuals and as a collective. Although a number of scholars have discussed the importance of the worship of the imperial family for elites within provincial communities, only in the past two decades has the discussion spread to the role of priestesses in their communities.³⁵⁷ This chapter expands on that discussion. The first part examines the *divae* who received honors in the provinces of the Gauls, the Spains, and North Africa. The second part examines the establishment of priestesses and addresses questions of civic benefaction, power and authority, and the role of women in civic life. The third part focuses specifically on the individual *divae* who received priesthoods in order to address the connections made to specific individual members of the imperial family in communities in the provinces.

The *Divae*

The first woman to be officially deified in the city of Rome was not the wife of an emperor. Although Livia had received numerous exceptional honors during her lifetime, Tiberius would not allow her to be deified stating that she would not have wished it.³⁵⁸ However, the exceptional honors granted to her served as a model for the honors granted to other women of the imperial family. These escalating honors ultimately culminated in Caligula's granting of divine honors to Drusilla in 38 CE. The account of her funeral and *consecratio* in Cassius Dio provides the only detailed account of the deification of a woman.³⁵⁹ Yet Cassius Dio's description of Drusilla's deification closely mirrors that of the two previous deifications, Julius Caesar and

Augustus. Her deification was celebrated by the Arval Brethren within the city of Rome on Augustus's birthday (23 September), and this date may have been chosen to promote the family connection between this new *diva* and her divine ancestor.³⁶⁰ The location, the temple of Augustus, strengthens this connection and serves to unite the divine imperial family.

Caligula's use of family, especially female members, appears to be unprecedented, but when examined more closely, it demonstrates the adherence to previous forms of self-promotion through the granting of exceptional honors to family members. The only difference in his case is that he had no male relatives on whom to lavish gifts. Instead, the use of exceptional honors as tools of legitimization and self-promotion rested with the female members of his family.³⁶¹ Whatever the motivation for the establishment of these honors, their presence highlights the important role women played in the construction and promotion of the imperial family in Rome and throughout the provinces.

The *divae* were celebrated and worshipped in a number of ways in the provinces. As one would expect from other religious practices, the most common way to honor a deity was through dedicated offerings or sacrifices. As discussed in chapter 3, temples dedicated to named individuals were rare in the provinces; temples were more commonly dedicated to the collective worship of the imperial family or to two or more named individuals. Because the community bore responsibility for funding, constructing, and dedicating these temples, it seems logical that community leaders might decide to have only one temple serve as the focal point for the worship of the entire family.³⁶² Although dedications made to individual *diva* are also rare, the few surviving dedications made to particular *divae* demonstrate that individuals sought to connect themselves with the deified female members of the imperial family. There is evidence of a dedication being made to Diva Drusilla and Minerva for the health of the emperor (*pro salute caesarum*) from the community of Avaricum Biturigum in Aquitania.³⁶³ This dedication was made by Gaius Agileius Primus, a *sevir Augustales* (an office discussed in chapter 5). Most likely dating to the reign of Caligula, who included the names of his sisters to be included in vows and in the propositions of the consuls to the Senate,³⁶⁴ this is the only example of a deified female member of the imperial family being included in a *pro salute* dedication.

The other surviving inscriptions for dedications made to the deified women of the imperial family rarely include information other than the name of the *diva*. In many cases, the nature and the purpose of the inscriptions are unclear. In the colony of Saldae, a dedication was

made to Diva Sabina.³⁶⁵ An inscription to Diva Sabina Augusta was also set up in the community of Thamugadi, but no information other than her name was included.³⁶⁶ Similarly the decurions from the community of Gillium set up a dedication to Diva Julia Domna with their own money.³⁶⁷

These inscriptions demonstrate that news of the deification of these women spread throughout the empire and that individual communities then sought to honor these women with dedications. Although these dedications are rare and are less pronounced than those to their male counterparts, their existence hints at a larger tradition of commemoration of and dedication not only to the living emperor and emperors who were deified after their deaths but also to the other divine members of the imperial family. However, these dedications demonstrate that individuals and communities in the western provinces were making dedications to these members of the imperial family but do not necessarily suggest that cult practices or priesthoods were set up in these communities.

The Priestesses

A number of titles were granted to priestesses responsible for overseeing some aspect of the worship of the imperial family. Although little evidence of priestesses of this type survives from Rome beyond brief mentions in the literary sources, nevertheless, priestesses played an important role in the worship of the imperial family in communities throughout the provinces. As discussed in chapters 2 and 3, priesthoods of the imperial cult brought honor and prestige for both the individual and members of his or her family.³⁶⁸ By becoming involved in the worship of the imperial family, women could engage in the public life of the communities in which they lived, especially when other avenues, such as holding political office, were not available to them. However, the fragmentary nature of the evidence makes it difficult to determine the exact social status of the women holding these priesthoods, although the cost of the *summa honoraria* and other responsibilities would have restricted this office to women with at least some financial resources.³⁶⁹

As discussed in chapter 2, female members of the imperial family may have served as role models for female benefactors in the provincial communities.³⁷⁰ Many of these women also served as priestesses in Rome for their husbands and relatives.³⁷¹ The most common title for these priestesses was *flaminica*, although there is one inscription from the city of Rome which refers to Antonia as a *sacerdos divi Augusti*.³⁷² Although these priesthoods could serve as a model for those in the provinces in some way, the position of these women as

priestesses of male deities was not copied by the priestesses in provincial communities. Instead, all the municipal priestesses were responsible for overseeing either one individual *diva*, the *divae* as a collective, or the imperial family as a whole.

The nature and responsibilities of imperial priesthoods were not always made explicit in the priestly titles found on commemorative inscriptions, and the female priestesses were no exception. The recent work of Emily Hemelrijk has specifically addressed this problem and it is not my intention to repeat her work here.³⁷³ However, in the interest of completeness, it is worth briefly summarizing the priestly titles and discussing these offices with a few specific case studies before addressing the question of how communities went about setting up these priesthoods, their motivations for doing so, and the specific *divae* with whom they sought to forge connections.

Similar to the evidence for male priests, some of the issues associated with reconstructing the responsibilities and roles of imperial priestesses result from the ambiguity of the titles as they survive in the honorific inscriptions. For municipal priestesses, the basic title was either *flaminica* or *sacerdos*. *Flaminica* was by far the more common, with *sacerdos* used only in Italy and in the provinces of Spain. Similar to their male counterparts, this distinction was not a result of cult focusing on living versus deified individuals, cult centered on altars versus temples, or cult in “Romanized” versus less “Romanized” provinces.³⁷⁴ With the limited number of surviving inscriptions, it also does not appear to be a case of variation over time. Instead, these terms seem to be synonymous and reflect the regional preferences and localized nature of the establishment of cult practices within provincial communities. As was the case with the male priests, the title *flaminica* was also used to denote the provincial priesthood, and although it is usually qualified with *provinciae*, it is difficult if not impossible to tell the difference between the two priesthoods in fragmentary inscriptions and inscriptions that lack qualifiers.

In most cases, a qualifier is attached to the title *flaminica* or *sacerdos*.³⁷⁵ This qualifier may relate to the community in which the priesthood was held (such as *flaminica perpetua municipii Vallitani*),³⁷⁶ the individual whose cult the priestess was responsible for overseeing (such as *flaminica divae Plotinae*),³⁷⁷ a collective term for the imperial family (such as *Augustarum* or *domus divinae*),³⁷⁸ or some temporal reference (for example, *designata*, *prima*, *bis*, and *perpetua*).³⁷⁹ *Perpetua* was most commonly used a qualifier for priestesses in the provinces of North Africa, similar to their *flamen perpetuus* counterparts. Some of the qualifiers refer to the specific *diva* for whose cult the priestess is

responsible. No uniform rule explains which empresses received their own priestess, nor did the towns of the western provinces strictly follow the lead of Rome.³⁸⁰ This is similar to the way in which male priesthoods also functioned in the provinces, although the female priesthoods appear to be on a smaller scale (largely based on the amount of surviving evidence).

Although the responsibilities of priestesses, especially with regard to actual cult activity, are not always clear, their involvement in the community cannot be disputed. The municipal council chose and elected the priestesses, and they appear to have held office for one year. Titles such as *flaminica perpetua* suggest that these priesthoods were held for life.³⁸¹ As with most priesthoods, imperial priestesses were required to pay a *summa honoraria*, and throughout their tenures in office, they demonstrated their generosity by giving gifts such as setting up statues to gods, goddesses, and emperors; building and refurbishing temples and other public buildings; staging plays and hosting games; and celebrating festivals or the dedications of these projects with banquets.³⁸² Similar to others who were barred from political office (such as freedmen, discussed in chapter 5), both individuals and their communities benefited from the opportunities made available through this priesthood. This office enabled influential women within the community to improve their own positions, contribute to the life of their communities, and ensure posthumous fame through statues and inscriptions.

These priestesses played an important role in civic benefaction, and the honor and social prestige achieved through this office benefited not only the priestess herself but also her family.³⁸³ However, focusing on the connection between these priestesses and their male relatives and suggesting that the increase in status for the priestesses' male relatives simplifies the complex nature and motivations behind civic munificence and the roles of individuals within their communities. Although it has been argued that these priestesses received the title of *flaminica* because of the positions held by their husbands, Hemelrijk has recently shown that many of these women were priestesses in their own right.³⁸⁴ For example, in Volubilis, a *flaminica prima* was honored by with a statue erected by her husband with his own money.³⁸⁵ There is nothing to suggest that he held any kind of office and, since it is common for husbands or male relatives to include their offices in inscriptions commemorating *flaminicae*, this priestess likely achieved her priesthood and position in this community because of her own position and actions.³⁸⁶

Although there are some examples of *flaminicae* who do not appear to have any connection to male officeholders, many priestesses were

either married to or related to individuals who held imperial priesthoods,³⁸⁷ but this is most likely because of the status of these individuals in their communities rather than a conscious decision by the community to have the offices held by married couples. In fact, the conclusion that priestesses held their offices because of their relationship with *flamines* originates in an interpretation of the *Lex de Flamonio Provinciae Narbonensis*. This inscription, whose form is discussed in chapter 3, is largely reconstructed, and the interpretation of the role of the *flamen*'s wife is based on a reconstruction that supplies *uxor* in a part of the text that does not survive. The inscription seems to hint at restrictions and honors granted to the wife of the *flamen*, but many *flaminicae* are priestesses in their own right rather than wives of the *flamines* who then use the title *flaminica*. To what extent this inscription reflects the reality of municipal priesthoods in the provinces is unclear, especially considering the fact that it refers to the provincial flamine rather than the municipal one, but it seems unlikely that the office of the female municipal priesthood would be modeled on the Vestal Virgins or follow the restrictions placed on the wife of the *flamen Dialis* in Rome,³⁸⁸ especially considering the localized nature of municipal priesthoods.

Familial connections within the imperial house played an important role in the promotion of the emperors throughout the empire, and many of the benefactions granted to communities by individuals highlighted these relationships. As part of her *ob honorem flaminicatus*, Nanneia Instania Fida promised colossal statues to Divus Verus and to Marcus Aurelius.³⁸⁹ The dedication to Divus Verus highlights his connection to the ruling emperor through the use of *frater*, which precedes Marcus Aurelius and all of his titles. The dedication of these two statues therefore honored not only the newly deified individual but the surviving emperor as well. The promotion of Marcus Aurelius as the brother of a *divus* further highlighted his familial connections not only to his deified father and other ancestors but also to his own brother. The second statue was dedicated to Marcus Aurelius, and the inscription traces his ancestry back to Divus Nerva (*abnepos divi Nervae*).³⁹⁰ Another such *ob honorem flamonis* was given by the father of Quinta, a *flaminica perpetua*, to celebrate her priesthood. In this case, he dedicated a statue to Divus Hadrian and Lucius Verus, and to celebrate the dedication, also distributed meat and oil.³⁹¹ In each of these cases, these priestesses were connected to the emperor and his divine family even if their priestly titles were not qualified with the names of the individuals for whose cult they were responsible.

These imperial priestesses were responsible for the establishment of a variety of buildings and sacred spaces within their communities, and these buildings were not necessarily related exclusively to the imperial

cult. For example, Lucilia Cale, a *flaminica* of the colony of Thuburbo in Africa Proconsularis, built a temple to Mercury Sobrius, the genius of the *pagus* of Sesase, and Pantheus Augustus.³⁹² She built this temple on her own (*a solo*) and dedicated it for the safety of Septimius Severus and Julia Domna (*pro salute*). This inscription highlights Lucilia's gift to the community and her devotion to fulfilling her vow for the safety of the imperial couple as well as the fact that many temples were dedicated to a variety of gods serving a variety of roles in particular communities.

The titles *flaminica* and *sacerdos* include variety of qualifiers, all of which suggest a trend toward the worship of the *divae* as a collective rather than as individuals. This is likely because of the cost of priesthoods and buildings dedicated to particular individuals within a community, and communities may have been more focused on drawing connections with individual emperors rather than the female members of their family. There are significantly fewer surviving examples of individual *divae* with priesthoods dedicated to them in the provinces than there are individual *divi*. However, examining these individuals in detail can illustrate how knowledge of the *divae* spread throughout the provinces and how specific communities chose to connect themselves with the female members of the imperial family.

Priestesses of Individual *Divae*

Priestesses dedicated to the worship of an individual *diva* are significantly more rare than their male counterparts.³⁹³ In the provinces covered in this study, with the exception of a priestess of Diva Plotina from North Africa, only Diva Augusta (Livia) received priestesses as a named individual.³⁹⁴ This does not mean that the *divae* were not worshipped in the provinces, only that it was more common for individuals to be priestesses of the *divae* as a collective. Hemelrijk suggests that because of the proportion of imperial priestesses to priests is approximately 1:4.5, towns might only have had one priestess at a time.³⁹⁵ She also suggests that even though some priestesses were dedicated to the worship of one *diva*, they would also likely oversee the worship of the imperial family in general.

The variation in priestesses dedicated to individual *divae* is significantly greater in Italy and so it is worth briefly discussing these individuals before focusing on the priestesses from the communities in the Gauls, the Spains, and North Africa. In Italy, there are priestesses attested for Drusilla,³⁹⁶ Livia,³⁹⁷ Flavia Domitilla,³⁹⁸ Julia,³⁹⁹ Marciana,⁴⁰⁰ Matidia,⁴⁰¹ Plotina,⁴⁰² Sabina,⁴⁰³ and Faustina (Elder and Younger).⁴⁰⁴ The most common title is *sacerdos*, but in some cases, such as the priestesses of Drusilla, Livia, and Julia, the title used is

flaminica. Each of these *divae* had one or two priestesses dedicated to their worship, and in many cases, the priestesses were commemorated for gifts given to their communities.⁴⁰⁵ In some cases, these gifts were directly related to the priesthood (*summa honoraria*), whereas in other cases, these benefactions were likely an attempt to increase their social prestige. Antonia Picentina, a *sacerdos divae Faustinae*, added statues to embellish the theater in her community.⁴⁰⁶ Among these statues was one dedicated to Antoninus Pius, the husband of the *diva* for whose cult she was responsible. The dedication of a statue to Antoninus Pius may have promoted the connection between the living emperor and his divine wife, thereby promoting the priestess who was responsible for setting up this statue as well as overseeing Diva Faustina's cult.

There are also several examples of individuals dedicated to the worship of multiple named *divae*. Albucia Candida was the priestess of two *divae*, Diva Julia in the community of Novaria and Diva Sabina in Ticinum.⁴⁰⁷ These communities were near each other, and she may have first held the priesthood in her hometown of Novaria and then later moved to Ticinum. The deifications of these two individuals were separated by approximately fifty years (given the uncertain date of Julia's deification), which suggests that either priesthoods were held immediately following the *diva*'s deification and thus that this priestess held these offices very early and late in life or that some communities continued to set up priesthoods to named individuals well after their deification. The inscription begins by listing the titles of an individual whose name does not survive. This individual likely was a relative of the priestess, most likely her husband. He also held a variety of priesthoods to named individuals (*flamen divi Hadriani*; *flamen divorum Vespasiani et Traiani*), but these titles do not include the names of communities so it is unclear whether he held these offices in different communities as his wife did. The fact that both these individuals held priesthoods dedicated to named *divi* and *divae* suggests that they both sought to gain the prestige that came with a direct connection to a named individual rather than the collective divine imperial family.

A woman whose name is lost due to the fragmentary nature of the inscription was a *sacerdos* of Diva Plotina in Pollentia and then of Diva Faustina in Augusta Taurinorum (although it is unclear which Faustina is meant here) and finally of Diva Faustina Maior in Concordia if the order of these titles as presented in the inscription was the order in which they were held.⁴⁰⁸ Fifty-three years passed between the deification of Diva Plotina (122 CE) and Diva Faustina Minor (175 CE), and if the priesthood in Augusta Taurinorum was held before the one in Concordia and the priesthood in Augusta

Taurinorum was indeed dedicated to Diva Faustina Minor, this priestess must have held her first priesthood at a very young age and lived well into her sixties or seventies if these priesthoods were granted immediately following each *diva*'s deification.⁴⁰⁹ Alternatively, as was the case with some of the priests discussed in chapter 3, priesthoods might have been established to these *divae* as individuals in certain communities well after their original deification. If the priesthoods were inscribed in the order in which she held them and if the priesthood in Augusta Taurinorum was dedicated to the worship of Diva Faustina Minor, then this would have to be the case. She would have then held the priesthood of Diva Faustina Maior in Concordia after 175 CE (at least thirty-four years after her deification). This complicated situation could be simplified by suggesting that she served as priestess of Diva Faustina Maior in both communities and that Maior was excluded from the priesthood held in Augusta Taurinorum in the interest of space. In any case, these two examples demonstrate that at least some of these women moved around the empire and played significant roles in the civic life of the communities in which they lived.

The evidence for priesthoods outside of Italy is much more fragmentary and limited in the variation of titles. There are only four examples of priestesses dedicated to the worship of a named female member of the imperial family in the provinces of Gaul, and all come from Narbonensis. Two of these priestesses were *flaminicae Iuliae Augustae*, suggesting that they were responsible for overseeing the worship of Livia during her lifetime.⁴¹⁰ Unlike the male priests of Livia from Lusitania discussed in chapter 2, these two priesthoods are occupied by women. The inscriptions themselves do not provide any details besides the names of the priestesses and in one case some of her male relatives. The other two priestesses are *flaminicae divae Augustae*, although both inscriptions are so fragmentary that nothing else is known about these two individuals.⁴¹¹ This province also had only three priests dedicated to the worship of an individual *divus*, and all were to Divus Augustus. This suggests that at least some consistency existed between the male and female priests of the imperial cult and that this province was attempting to make a connection with the first emperor and his wife.

The only possible priestess dedicated to the worship of an individual *diva* in the Spanish provinces comes from the community of Abdera in Baetica.⁴¹² This priesthood uses the title *sacerdos* and is the only example from outside of Italy of the use of that term. The title *sacerdos divae Augustae* has been restored, so it is impossible to know exactly for which deity's cult she was responsible, but the inscription does suggest that she was involved in civic benefaction within her

community (possibly a basilica), although acts of civic benefaction were not limited to the imperial priesthood. The inscription is extremely fragmentary, so it is difficult to determine any other information about this individual and her position within her community.

The surviving evidence suggests a strong focus on public benefaction for these priestesses. However, only one example survives of a priestess paying for a temple to the empress for whose cult she was responsible.⁴¹³ Coelia Victoria Potita, *flaminica divae Augustae*, established a temple for *diva Augusta* in Cirta, Africa Proconsularis, in 42–43 CE.⁴¹⁴ Although the temple was dedicated by Quintus Marcius Barea, Coelia's resources funded the project. This example demonstrates that in some communities, individual *divae* were granted their own sacred space and that individuals and communities bore responsibility for funding and overseeing these projects.

The only *diva* other than Diva Augusta to get a priest in the Gauls, the Spains, and North Africa was Diva Plotina. Cassia Maximula, celebrated as a *flaminica* of Diva Plotina, vowed a temple to the goddess Caelestis, which was then built and decorated by her husband and son.⁴¹⁵ Although this priestess is not responsible for overseeing her vow on her own, this dedication highlighted her priesthood and promoted not only her own status but also that of her husband and son. Her husband is a *sacerdos publicus*, and her son is a *flamen perpetuus* and aedile. This inscription demonstrates the funds and resources expended by this priestess's family to fulfill her vow. They not only built the temple but also adorned it with marble, mosaics, a statue, and a breastplate. The family connection here, with both mother and son holding priesthoods of the imperial cult, suggests that this was an influential family in this community, although Cassia's priesthood directly connects her to Diva Plotina, unlike her son, who was responsible for overseeing the collective worship of the imperial family.

The evidence for priestesses does suggest a gender segregation of cult personnel and the *divi/divae* they served, but some of the early priests of Livia during her lifetime were men, at least in the province of Lusitania (discussed in chapter 2). In Rome, some of the earliest priests of the newly deified emperors were their wives and other female relations.⁴¹⁶ However, in the provinces in the Latin West, there are no examples of women following this model and becoming priestesses of emperors. That said, it has been suggested that the collective qualifiers such as *perpetua* and *flaminica Augg* (expanded as *Augustarum*) may also suggest that the imperial family was worshipped more commonly as a collective and that these female

priestesses may have also overseen the worship of the male members.⁴¹⁷ Some scholars have used the familial relationships outlined within an inscription to suggest that perhaps the priestess being honored (Annia Aelia Restituta, a *flaminica perpetua*) succeeded her father (who was a *flamen Augusti perpetuus*) and took over his role overseeing the worship of the male members of the imperial family.⁴¹⁸ However, as discussed throughout this book, although there are some examples of various members of a particular family holding priesthoods, these priesthoods do not appear to be hereditary, and there are no other examples of this kind of succession among priesthoods in the provinces.

The evidence discussed throughout this chapter has demonstrated that the role of priestesses of the imperial cult resembled that of their male counterparts, though on a smaller scale. Many communities and individuals within those communities sought to connect themselves with specific members of the imperial family, but it was more common to establish priesthoods dedicated to worshipping the imperial family as a collective. There does appear to be gender segregation of cult personnel, but even though a priestess was dedicated to the worship of a named individual and female members of the imperial family, she still could honor the emperor or other members of his family with statues, dedications, and other gifts.

Priesthoods dedicated to named *divae* are significantly more rare than their male counterparts, and although a number of named *divae* receive priests in Italy, evidence survives only for priestesses of Diva Augusta and Diva Plotina in the provinces of the Gauls, the Spains, and North Africa. This demonstrates that priestesses, like their male counterparts, were more likely to be dedicated to the worship of the imperial family as a collective rather than individuals, at least in the provincial communities farther away from Rome. This may be a result of the cost associated with dedicating resources to the worship of a particular individual or of the fact that the prestige associated with and connections made to an individual *diva* were less beneficial than connections to the emperor himself or his deified ancestors.

In the cases where individuals were set up as priestesses of specific *divae*, ten of the sixteen *divae* received priestesses outside of the city of Rome in the West. In some cases, such as Albucia Candida, individuals held individual priesthoods in separate communities, suggesting the importance and prestige associated with these positions as well as a desire to forge connections with specific *divae* within particular communities. However, only one example shows a priestess responsible for a temple for the *diva* for whose cult she was responsible. Instead, most of the evidence highlights more general

gifts and benefactions for the community rather than specific religious responsibilities, making any reconstruction of the religious role of these women (and their male counterparts as discussed in chapter 3) extremely problematic.

Regardless of the exact nature of their religious function, these priesthoods promoted the status of the priestess and of the influential female members of the community. Serving as priestesses of the imperial cult allowed women to increase their prestige and social status within their communities, providing an avenue for self-promotion that was otherwise not open to them through political offices or other means.

Chapter 5

Magistrates or Priests?

The **Augustales*

The commemoration and worship of the imperial family became an important feature of religious and political life under the principate, and even though only a few priesthoods dedicated to the worship of the imperial family were established during the reign of Augustus and immediately following his death, the worship of the emperor and his family quickly spread throughout the empire. The *Augustales* and *seviri Augustales*, an organization or group of organizations (the surviving evidence remains unclear about whether these titles reflect variation in titulature or denote separate groups) established at the end of the 1st century BCE, played an influential role in spreading this worship.⁴¹⁹ The organization/s were found throughout Italy and the provinces (although they are only found in *coloniae* in the East) but were not present in the city of Rome. For this reason, the **Augustales* serve as an excellent case study for an analysis of the adoption and spread of the imperial cult throughout the Latin West. More than twenty-five hundred inscriptions provide evidence of their existence between 12 BCE and the mid-3rd century CE.⁴²⁰ This chapter traces the development of the **Augustales* by first summarizing the scholarly consensus relating to the study of the various titles and positions held by these individuals. It then turns to the development of the **Augustales* in Italy and the spread of these titles throughout the provinces of the Gauls, the Spains, and North Africa. Finally, it presents and discusses the evidence that supports the interpretation of individuals holding this office as priests and their role in promoting the imperial family throughout the empire.

Modern discussions of the *Augustales* and *seviri Augustales* tend to expand on a broad consensus that can be summarized as follows.⁴²¹ These groups were established during the reign of Augustus, with the earliest inscriptions dating to 13–12 BCE.⁴²² They were involved in some aspect of the worship of the imperial family, although whether this was their primary function is still fiercely debated.⁴²³ Various inscriptions demonstrate a number of different religious functions, not only in relation to imperial cult practices but also in relation to cult paid to Roman deities (such as Mercury and Silvanus) and native deities (such as Rosmerta).

The **Augustales* were present almost exclusively in the Latin West but not in Rome itself.⁴²⁴ They were commonly but not always selected by the *decuriones*⁴²⁵ and were expected to pay *summa honoraria*, usually by funding public entertainments and building projects.⁴²⁶ They received special honors, closely resembling the honors given to magistrates: *lictors*, *fascēs*, reserved places at games and public banquets, the *toga praetexta*, and occasionally public funerals. By outward appearance and by the honors they received, individuals in these groups looked very similar to priests and magistrates. They also played an important role in the building programs and civic landscape of their communities. The surviving evidence seems to suggest that individuals holding this office do not fit neatly into either category of magistrate or priest, although this should not be surprising, considering the overlapping roles within the city of these two types of offices.

Modern discussions commonly suggest that individuals were recruited for this office primarily from among freedmen.⁴²⁷ These discussions also stress that the institution of the **Augustales* was a way for freedmen to achieve a status not otherwise open to them.⁴²⁸ Similar to the female priests discussed in chapter 4, the **Augustales* could gain social prestige and symbolic capital that was not available to them through the secular offices from which they were excluded. However, there were areas in the empire where the **Augustales* consisted of a large proportion of freeborn individuals, demonstrating that these groups may have been attractive to both wealthy freedmen and those who were freeborn.⁴²⁹ Moreover, this position may have been available to freeborn individuals who lacked enough wealth for other priesthoods or magistracies within the community. These groups appear to occupy a place in the community directly below the *decuriones* and sometimes are referred to as a second order.⁴³⁰

The **Augustales* in Italy

Almost half the evidence for the **Augustales* comes from the Italian peninsula, with **Augustales* being present in almost every town.⁴³¹ For this reason, recent scholarship has focused on Italy in an attempt to determine how these groups were established, what type of people were drawn to these groups, and the nature of their function.⁴³² It is not my intention to create a complete catalogue of the evidence but nevertheless it is worth briefly examining how these groups functioned in two communities, Misenum and Herculaneum.

Campania contains some of the earliest archaeological evidence of these groups.⁴³³ There are two possible sanctuaries attributed to the **Augustales*, one in Misenum and one in Herculaneum, both dating to

the mid-1st century CE. The sanctuary at Misenum, discovered in 1968, contains three vaulted chambers and a large forecourt.⁴³⁴ A number of inscriptions and statues provide insight into the nature of its organization and administration from the Julio-Claudian period to the end of the Antonine period. The bases of ten statues survive: one uninscribed, three to emperors (one to Trajan, two to Nerva), four of divinities (Apollo, Liber Pater, Asclepius, and Venus), and two dedicated to individual *Augustales*.⁴³⁵ The sanctuary itself is referred to in an inscription found at the location.⁴³⁶ Although it is unclear whether these statues served as cult statues, the promotion of the emperor, gods, and influential members of the community of *Augustales* hints at the importance of self-representation and promotion through dedications and inscriptions.

An *Augusto sacrum* inscription dedicated to the *genius Augustalium* was set up by Sextus Gellius Georgus, a *curator Augustalium*, with his own resources.⁴³⁷ This inscription commemorates not only the individual who set up the dedication, which also promotes his own resources and position, but also the collective body of *Augustales* by making a dedication specifically to their *genius*. This inscription serves as one of the first examples of a dedication made to the *genius* of the **Augustales*, a type of dedication that would later be found in a number of other communities throughout the empire.

Quintus Cominius Abascantus was an *Augustales* within this community who seemed obsessed with perpetuating his own memory.⁴³⁸ The surviving statue base honoring him was set up by his wife, Nymphidia Monime. The base itself contains three inscriptions that outline not only his career and his benefactions to the community but also the specific ways in which the money he had left was to be used to perpetuate his memory.⁴³⁹ Although it is true that freedmen and first generation *ingenui* tend to be more commonly commemorated in inscriptions,⁴⁴⁰ this statue base is exceptional in its methodical presentation of how to use his legacy and the new status of his wife, an important aspect of this inscription directly relevant to this study.

Following the death of her husband, Nymphidia, his wife and heir, received some exceptional honors from the *Augustales* of Misenum. Although *Augustales* commonly had certain rights and privileges, such as passing their own decrees, Nymphidia is co-opted into the *Augustales* by the *Augustales*' own initiative.⁴⁴¹ This is the first example of anyone being co-opted into the "order," and it is interesting that this evidence pertains to a woman. We have no examples of female *Augustales*, and this ceremonial position may have been granted in thanks for the numerous benefactions granted by her husband. Through his position as *Augustalis*, Quintus Cominius Abascantus thus

not only promoted his own position but also increased the status of his wife and ensured the continued promotion of their memory.

Herculaneum also hosted a large sanctuary assumed to be a meeting place for the **Augustales* that dates to the mid-1st century CE. This assignment is based on three inscriptions.⁴⁴² The sanctuary consisted of a square hall with a small shrine-like chamber that included a niche as well as a small room leading off of it, possibly for the building's custodian.⁴⁴³ The first dedication, which was made to Augustus, involved a feast paid for with these brothers' own money and was offered to the *decuriones* and *Augustales*. Feasting was an important part of the life of the **Augustales*, and this dedication promotes not only the position of these two brothers but also the position of the *Augustales* within this community.⁴⁴⁴

Around 70 CE, Vibidia Saturnina and Aulus Furius Saturninus dedicated images of the Caesars (most likely Titus and Domitian, although Vespasian may also have been included) and a temple to Venus.⁴⁴⁵ They also gave money to the *decuriones* and *Augustales*, the people of Herculaneum, and members of the college of Venus. Their connection to the *Augustales* is unclear, but this inscription highlights the position of *Augustales* within the community and the ways in which individuals could promote themselves through donations and dedications.

The titles *Augustales*, *seviri Augustales*, and *magistri Augustales* all appear at roughly the same time, and in some communities where a number of inscriptions survive, all three groups are attested. Rome's notable absence from the list of communities from which evidence of the **Augustales* survive may result in part from the fact that other groups filled the role of the **Augustales* in the capital city. The *vicomagistri*, a group composed predominantly of freedmen whose main function was associated with the cult of the Lares at the *compita* (which also included the Augustan Lares after 7 BCE),⁴⁴⁶ held a position similar to that of the **Augustales*.⁴⁴⁷ This date of 7 BCE is later than the earliest evidence of the **Augustales* (which have been attested in communities as early as 13 BCE) but is close enough to suggest that both *vicomagistri* and **Augustales* were important features of Augustus's reorganization and religious reforms.⁴⁴⁸ The **Augustales* were involved most frequently in building projects and hosting games. However, in the city of Rome, the emperor and members of his family and inner circle were responsible for these gifts to the city. The varied nature of these groups means that it is difficult to determine why they appear in some communities and not others. Nevertheless, the overlap in functions between the *vicomagistri*, the **Augustales*, other priesthoods and municipal offices, and even the emperor, members of

his family and inner circle may provide some insight into the distribution of these groups.

Italy's eleven regions have varying numbers of extant inscriptions attesting to the **Augustales*, with the pattern of distribution generally following the overall number of inscriptions for each region.⁴⁴⁹ In most areas, all three titles (and some other less common variations) are found. The most notable exception is Regio II, where the title of *Augustales* is used almost exclusively. There is no evidence of *sevir Augustales* in this area, though some less common variations are attested. This shows that, in general, communities were likely to adopt titles commonly found in the surrounding communities but that the community itself ultimately could determine which titles it would use.

****Augustales* throughout the Gallic, Spanish, and North African Provinces**

Before discussing the spread of the **Augustales* throughout the Latin West, it is worth summarizing the locations and frequencies of the different titles associated with these groups. Scholars have posited several different explanations for the diversity of titulature. It is commonly argued that some central control existed over how these groups were organized and spread throughout the empire, an argument that seems to contradict the variation of titles found. The variation has, therefore, been attributed to a reorganization dating to the reign of Trajan. However, this conclusion is based primarily on the evidence from Italy, and the inscriptional evidence from the provinces does not support this conclusion.⁴⁵⁰ More recently, Mouritsen has taken the other extreme and argued that these institutions were established by local initiative and were not the result of directives given from the center or a common model.⁴⁵¹

Some provinces used one title exclusively, while others included some or all of the variations. For example, in Africa Proconsularis and Numidia, *Augustalis* was almost exclusively used. However, this title is not found at all in the surviving evidence from the Gallic provinces, where *sevir Augustalis* was the most commonly used title. The evidence from the Spanish provinces demonstrates the use of all of the various titles, although *sevir Augustalis* was not found in Lusitania but was the most common title in Tarraconensis. This variation does not necessarily reflect different offices within these communities but may instead reflect different factors influencing the development and promotion of the **Augustales*. In addition, the variation between communities demonstrates that although local communities may have been influenced by neighboring communities, this influence may not have extended between provinces.

Table 3. Location and Frequencies of *Augustales*, *Seviri Augustales*, *Seviri*, and Other Variations on These Titles

Region/ Province	<i>Augustales</i>	<i>Seviri Augustales</i>	<i>Seviri</i>	Other
ITALY				
R09gio I				
R06gio II				
R27gio III				
R00gio IV				
R00gio V				
R08gio VI				
R08gio VII				
R07gio VIII				
R00gio IX				
R00gio X				
R05gio XI				
THE GAULS				
B05bonensis				
Aquitania				
Belgica				
B07gdunensis				
THE SPAINS				
B01rraconensis				
A07sitania				
B00etica				
NORTH AFRICA				
Africa Proconsularis				
B06midia				
M01auretaniam Tingitana				

Note: This table is based on the catalog by Duthoy 1976, 148–91, with the addition of evidence found in the past thirty-two years. The “Other” category includes variations on the titles (for example, *magistri Augustales*, *tresvir Augustales*, *sevir Claudialis*) and inscriptions where the title is not clear.

Within the Gallic provinces, five inscriptions survive from the province of Aquitania; four of them are fragmentary. They all come from communities that were not *coloniae* (Avaricum Biturigum, Cadurci, Eliumberrum, Lugdunum Convenarum, Mediolanum Santonum). The titles themselves vary greatly, with *Augustalis*, *sevir Augustalis*, and *sevir* attested, although this variation may result entirely from the fragmentary nature of the inscriptions rather than

from actual variation in titles. The inscriptions from Belgica are more uniform, with most of the titles being *sevir Augustalis*. There is one interesting variation, a *sevir Augustalis et Saturnia* from the *colonia* of Trier, which is a rare occurrence of a *sevir* with two qualifying titles.⁴⁵² Most of the other inscriptions do not refer to anything other than the name of the individual and his title. One inscription was set up by a *sevir Augustalis* to honor the *domus Augusta*.⁴⁵³ The largest number of surviving inscriptions from Tres Galliae comes from the province of Lugdunensis and more specifically from the *colonia* of Lugdunum. The title here is almost exclusively *sevir Augustalis*, with a couple of examples of *seviri* that can be dated to some time before 40 CE. Most of the inscriptions from this community range from the early 1st to the early 3rd centuries CE.

The inscriptions from the province of Narbonensis come predominantly from *coloniae*, with the greatest number coming from Narbo and Nemausus. The most common title is *sevir Augustalis*, although a few *seviri* and *Augustales* are also recorded. In some cases, the name of the town is included in this title. In one case, an individual *sevir Augustalis*, Aebutius Agatho, held this title both in Arelate and Aptae.⁴⁵⁴ The movement of influential individuals throughout the empire and the practice of individuals holding priesthoods in multiple communities further strengthened relationships between those communities and expanded religious networks.⁴⁵⁵ Such connections also suggest that decisions about which title to use likely depended on the titles used in the surrounding communities.

One particular title, *seviri Augustales corporati*, is found only in Narbonensis, where it is recorded in twenty inscriptions from throughout the province.⁴⁵⁶ Where they can be dated, these inscriptions date to the second century and, according to Duthoy, may reflect a reorganization of this group into the structure of a professional corporation.⁴⁵⁷ He argues that since many of the individuals within this group were merchants and traders, it should not be surprising that the organization of the **Augustales* appears to have been modeled on these other groups. Why this variation in title is only found in the province of Narbonensis is unclear. Two inscriptions survive from the *colonia* of Nemausus that appear to be dedicated to the same individual, Lucius Julius Nigrus.⁴⁵⁸ One of these inscriptions was set up by the *seviri Augustales corporati*, while the other was established by the *seviri corporati*. This strongly suggests that, at least in this community, the titles of *sevir Augustalis* and *sevir* could be used interchangeably, highlighting a general disinterest in specific titles among those inscribing the text.

The evidence from the Spanish provinces demonstrates a wider range of both titles and distribution of the **Augustales* than the Gallic provinces, with Baetica showing the greatest distribution. Some communities have multiple titles attested, but these inscriptions cannot be dated with any certainty, making it unclear whether the differences reflect a change over time or the presence of multiple organizations at the same time. However, the inscriptions that can be dated show that both *severi Augustales* and *severi*, the most common titles in Baetica, were present during the mid- to late 1st century CE. The inscriptions that refer to *Augustales* cannot be dated with any certainty, so the relationship of that title to the others is unclear. The title *Augustalis* is not found in communities where *severi Augustales* are attested but is sometimes found where *severi* are present.

The evidence from the province of Lusitania is slightly more confined in that it is restricted to only a few fairly major cities, a circumstance almost certainly related to Lusitania's status as the least urbanized of the three provinces. Here the most common title is *Augustalis*, with no evidence of the title of *sevir Augustalis*. The two communities with the largest body of extant evidence are Augusta Emerita (the provincial capital) and Olisipo (an important port town with the status of *municipium*). Both had extensive building programs and were critical in the development of the surrounding area. There is also evidence from the reign of Tiberius that these communities were instrumental in the early establishment of the worship of the imperial family, as discussed in chapter 2. Only about half of the inscriptions can be dated: all of the datable inscriptions from Olisipo date to the Julio-Claudian period.⁴⁵⁹

The largest body of extant evidence for these groups from the Iberian Peninsula comes from the province of Tarraconensis, with more than one hundred inscriptions. The most common title here is also *sevir Augustalis*, although a number of *seviri* are also present. There are only three references to *Augustales*, and they come from communities that have no evidence of *seviri Augustales* and that were not *coloniae* or *municipia*. As with most of the evidence found throughout the empire, these inscriptions are predominantly honorific and shed little light on what these offices entailed.

There is significantly less surviving evidence for **Augustales* in the provinces of North Africa. Since this area is where the most inscriptions survive outside of Italy, this suggests that such offices were less common in this region. In Numidia, most of the evidence comes from Theveste and dates to the period after the settlement received the status of *colonia*, sometime during the reign of Trajan. Most of the dedications refer to *universae curiae et Augustales* or some

variation thereof.⁴⁶⁰ All of these date to the period immediately following its promotion to *coloniae* except for four inscriptions referring to *curiae universae et Augustales* that date to the Severan period.⁴⁶¹ Several inscriptions were dedicated by individuals: an inscription *pro salute imperatoris* for Commodus that lists all of the *Augustalis*'s achievements, which included hosting games and a banquet with his own money,⁴⁶² and a dedication to Emperor Gordian Augustus.⁴⁶³ In another case, a whole group of *Augustales* (but not in connection with the *universae curiae*) set up a temple to Ceres Augusta.⁴⁶⁴

All of the inscriptions from Mauretania were dedications to deities and were set up by *seviri*. They date to sometime after 161 CE and come from the community of Volubilis. One inscription commemorated a dedication to Divus Antoninus Pius.⁴⁶⁵ The other two were set up to goddesses whose titles include the epithet *Augusta*: Diana Augusta and Isis Augusta.⁴⁶⁶ These dedications are discussed in further detail later in the chapter.

Although the surviving evidence for the **Augustales* appears to follow the overall pattern of the epigraphic habit, there is one notable exception worth expanding on for this study. After Italy, the most prolific epigraphic province was Africa Proconsularis. The largest body of surviving epigraphic evidence for priests of the imperial family also comes from this province. Yet Africa Proconsularis has only four surviving inscriptions referring to **Augustales*. All of these individuals served in *coloniae*, and all the inscriptions date to the 2nd century CE except for whose date is unknown.⁴⁶⁷ In addition to the inscription from Ammaedara, which was a dedication to Divus Marcus Aurelius set up by an *Augustalis* that is discussed later in the chapter, these inscriptions were commemorative inscriptions set up either by relatives of the *Augustalis* or in fulfillment of a vow.

The relatively few references to *Augustales* in this province are further complicated by the fact that no evidence of *Augustales* survives in the two most prominent *coloniae*, Lepcis Magna and Colonia Concordia Julia (Carthage). This suggests that a number of factors likely determined how and why certain communities set up the **Augustales* and that it was not necessarily dictated in the foundational charter of the *colonia* or established because of orders given directly from Rome. According to C. R. Whittaker and Kotula, the *curiae* seemed to fulfill a similar function in Africa, possibly explaining the lack of **Augustales* in this area.⁴⁶⁸ In some cases, the *curiae* is included in the title of the *Augustales*, although this connection is more apparent in the evidence surviving from Numidia, and the connection between these two groups is not made in the surviving evidence from

The **Augustales* as Priests

Similar to the issues discussed in chapters 3 and 4, several problems arise when trying to determine how and why **Augustales* were established and what role they played in the provincial communities. First, most of these inscriptions are brief funerary notices that rarely provide more details concerning the organization to which the deceased belonged. Second, more than half of these inscriptions cannot be dated, making a reconstruction of organizational development over time difficult. Finally, the fragmentary nature of many of the inscriptions further complicates analysis. However, a significant number of inscriptions concern **Augustales* involved in religious dedications, and some of these inscriptions can be dated, enabling them to be used to determine how these groups varied geographically and over time, thereby providing another avenue of inquiry into the worship of the imperial family, how these groups spread, and changes in religious practices over time.

The earliest religious dedication from a member of the **Augustales* outside of Italy comes from the *oppidum* Avaricum Biturigum in the province of Aquitania. A dedication was made for the health of the Caesars (*pro salute Caesarum*) to Minerva and to Diva Drusilla by Gaius Agileius, a *sevir Augustalis*.⁴⁷⁰ This inscription dates to the period immediately following the deification of Drusilla during the reign of Caligula and demonstrates that knowledge of the first deified woman was broadcast throughout the empire and that communities and individuals within those communities sought to worship this new deity. A connection appears to exist between Caligula and the goddess Minerva, and Suetonius relates that Caligula took his daughter, Julia Drusilla, born to him by Caesonia, through the temples of all the goddesses and finally placed her in the lap of Minerva.⁴⁷¹ Although it is unclear whether Caligula made a habit of connecting his family with Minerva, this inscription demonstrates a connection between the worship of the living emperor and his heirs, a goddess of the Roman pantheon (Minerva), and a deified member of the imperial family (Diva Drusilla).

The number of **Augustales* inscriptions increases dramatically during the 2nd century CE, in keeping with the overall increase in the Roman epigraphic habit in this period.⁴⁷² A notable exception, however, is the provinces in Africa, which have yielded a large number of inscriptions generally but have provided very few inscriptions referring to the **Augustales*. Inscriptions referring to the **Augustales* during the 2nd century CE show substantial variation as

well, as all the variations of titles are found and dedications are made not only to members of the imperial family (Trajan, Divus Antoninus Pius, and Commodus as well as a number of dedications for the health of the emperor and his family, the *domus divina*, and the *domus Augusta*) and to Roman gods (such as Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Juno Regina, Silvanus, Mithras, Magna Mater), native gods paired with Roman gods (Apollo Zminthio, Mercury and Rosmerta, Mars Beladonus), native gods (Bea Bebraci, Dea Nehalennia, Deus Varnenoni, Dea Nehalennia), gods with the epithet Augustus (Mercury Augustus, Diana Augusta, Mars Augustus, Isis Augusta, Aesculapius Augustus), and dedications made to the *genius* of a particular community (*genius coloniae Arelatensium* and *genius coloniae Nemausi*).

Many of these dedications were made *pro salute imperatoris* and include not only the emperor but also members of his family. In Lugdunum, an altar was erected and a *taurobolium* performed *pro salute imperatoris* (Antoninus Pius).⁴⁷³ The individual responsible for this act was Lucius Aemilius Carpus, a *sevir Augustalis*. In the community of Theveste, both Commodus and Crispina are included in this *pro salute* dedication.⁴⁷⁴ As discussed earlier, this inscription also commemorates the feasts given to (or by) the *Augustales* and a gymnasium established for the people. The fragmentary nature of this inscription makes it difficult to extract any other information, but the connections among banquets, building dedications, and the promotion and commemoration the imperial family are common. In addition to the *pro salute* form, dedications were made directly to living members of the imperial family. One such example comes from Narbo, where a *sevir Augustalis* made a dedication to the living emperor, Trajan.⁴⁷⁵

Although dedications to living emperors are the most common, dedications are made to living members of the imperial family as well. Returning to the Italian peninsula, a *sevir* (referred to as a *seviratus*) in Lilybaeum made a dedication to Titus Fulvius Aurelius Antonius, a son of Marcus Aurelius who was born in 161 CE and died four years later.⁴⁷⁶ This dedication was made *ob honorem* and with his own money. By choosing to make a dedication to the son of the emperor, Lucius Aponius Rufinus was attempting to forge a connection between himself and the ruling family rather than just the emperor himself, thereby stressing the importance of family members in the promotion of the emperor.

Even though many of the dedications set up by **Augustales* promoted particular individuals, whether the dedicator or the dedicatee, the **Augustales* were also promoted as a collective or a group, and there is evidence of the **Augustales* making dedications as a group. In Ammaedara, a dedication was made to Divus Marcus

Aurelius, who was promoted as the father of Commodus.⁴⁷⁷ This family connection and the fact that Commodus was *divi filius* of Marcus Aurelius constituted important parts of self-promotion within the imperial family. In addition, this dedication was made by a collective group of *Augustales*, none of whom are explicitly named. They set this up with their own money (*pecunia sua*) yet did not deem it necessary to name the individuals responsible for the dedication. Instead, this dedication demonstrates the importance of promoting the *Augustales* as a group and the status of this group within the community.

The promotion of groups can also be found in a dedication to the *genius collegii sevirorum Augustalium* from Nemausus.⁴⁷⁸ In this case, the *genius collegii sevirorum Augustalium* was being honored along with Deus Mars Augustus. This dedication is important for a number of reasons. First, the epithet *Augustus*, added to a number of Roman deities, connects them directly to the imperial family and may indicate that one aspect of the deity was responsible for overseeing the protection and safety of the imperial family.⁴⁷⁹ It functions in a way similar to epithets such as Mars Ultor or Venus Genetrix in that it relates to a specific aspect of these gods. Second, this inscription highlights the fact that the **Augustales* were seen as a sort of college and that dedications could be made to the *genius* of that group. This is just one more example of the promotion of the **Augustales* and the increased prestige of this group rather than the focus on individuals and self-promotion. In Thamugadi, the *ordo Augustalium* made a dedication with their own money (although what they dedicated is unclear). This demonstrates that at least in some areas, they promoted themselves as an *ordo* in addition to making these collective dedications.⁴⁸⁰

Familial connections (both the imperial family and the **Augustales'* own families) were an important factor in self-promotion and in the actions of the **Augustales* in a similar way to the priests discussed in chapters 2–4. In many cases, inscriptions were set up by family members to commemorate an **Augustalis* and promote his position within his community. As was the case with Quintus Cominius Abascantus and his wife, Nymphidia, from Misenum, the importance of the promotion of one's legacy and the increase in social status that this office granted were important aspects of these types of commemoration. Imperial family connections were also made through the commemoration of both the living emperor and his deified father (in the case of the dedication to Divus Marcus Aurelius and Commodus from Ammaedara) or a *pro salute* dedication for the emperor and his wife (Commodus and Crispina from Theveste). These inscriptions follow similar patterns to the promotion of priests and

priestesses of the imperial cult and the importance of the worship of the imperial family in the provincial communities.

The latest of the surviving dedicatory inscriptions in this collection of provinces comes from Aquae Thibilitanae in Numidia and was a dedication made to Emperor Gordian Augustus in 241 CE.⁴⁸¹ However, the inscription is extremely fragmentary and does not provide additional information. No later evidence survives regarding these groups, and we find a decline similar to that found in the municipal priests of the imperial cult. This may reflect a change in the ways in which individuals were commemorated, result from the turmoil of the 3rd century, or follow the general trend of a decrease in surviving inscriptional evidence. However, the importance of family promotion, both the imperial family and that of the **Augustalis* himself, played an important role throughout the period covered by the extant evidence.

Despite the difficulties posed by the nature of the epigraphic evidence, it is possible to draw some tentative conclusions about the establishment and development of **Augustales* as well as how this office served as a means by which individuals could increase their status, gain symbolic capital, and connect themselves with members of the imperial family. First, it appears that no single archetype existed for the creation, development, and organization of the **Augustales*, meaning that Rome seems to have provided no (or little) guidance about how these groups should be established or what they should be called. There is no evidence for the establishment of **Augustales* in the surviving parts of the municipal or colonial charters, although admittedly this material is fragmentary. The groups appear to be extremely localized, and there is no evidence that they spread from a particular location. However, some models certainly existed, as did an enthusiasm for imitating them at least in some way. For example, particular titles and conventions appear to be more common in certain geographical regions. This may demonstrate that when establishing these offices, communities sometimes (but not always) looked to their neighbors for the appropriate titulature.

Second, individuals holding these offices were somehow responsible for some of the religious practices within the communities in which they resided. The fact that the earliest inscriptions were dedications to the imperial family suggests that this was a key original feature of these groups that remained central to their activities throughout the period for which evidence of their existence survives.

Finally, the religious dedications made by the **Augustales* followed a similar pattern to the overall religious dedications throughout the empire. The gods who received abundant dedications, such as Jupiter

Optimus Maximus with Juno, were found in a number of the **Augustales*' dedications. It was also a common feature of many of the communities in the provinces to have gods native to the population paired up with Roman gods (Rosmerta was almost always found paired with Mercury during the imperial period). The focus of religious practices on the imperial family was also a major feature of the entire imperial period and was not restricted to the **Augustales*. Not only were members of the imperial family given cult (for example, Diva Drusilla or any number of emperors), but dedications were also made to the *domus divina* or *Augusta*. This reflects the increased importance of the imperial family throughout the empire and their role within the political as well as religious spheres.

Conclusion

The promotion of family was central to the establishment and development of the imperial cult. The exceptional honors granted to members of the imperial family not only set specific individuals apart and promoted heirs and successors but also united communities in the empire. Individuals living within those communities sought to connect themselves and their families with those in power. In some cases, they used the actions of the emperors and their families as models for their own positions within their communities. The opportunity to serve as a priest at a local level could further advance one's political and religious career. In many cases, the priesthood granted to one member of a household helped gain prestige for the entire family and led to other members receiving similar benefits, allowing them to further advance their own symbolic capital. Direct connections to the imperial family through priesthoods served not only as thanks for imperial benefactions granted to that community but also as a means of ensuring continued imperial favor.

Many of these statements appear to neglect the religious aspect of the imperial cult and instead focus on the connections between individuals and their communities and the emperor and his family. Worship of the imperial family no doubt had religious importance, but the nature of the surviving evidence in the Latin West makes it difficult to reach any concrete conclusions about ritual practice of the imperial cult in provincial communities and specifically about the sacrifices performed, the wording of prayers, and the format of feast days and other religious festivals. This study largely traces names of individuals and their priesthoods and does not attempt to reconstruct the exact nature of these priesthoods. What can be traced through these priesthoods are the types of connections made by individuals and communities to specific *divi* and *divae*.

The pattern of development of these priesthoods appears to depend largely on local initiative and local implementation. Communities tended to adopt similar titles to those found in their neighboring communities, allowing for regional variation in the titles used to denote these priesthoods, such as the *pontifex/pontufex* variation in Baetica and the use of *seviri Augustales* in the Gallic provinces versus the use of *Augustales* in the Spanish provinces. Individuals played important roles in the administration, development, and civic life of these communities. Even when the emperor rejected the desires of the province with respect to the establishment of provincial cult, many of

the communities still established their own cult practices at the local level. Some communities set up cult as a direct response to a member of the imperial family's involvement in their community. In other cases, the cult was established by a member of the imperial family, but it developed and changed through local initiative. Local communities bore responsibility for funding the establishment of cult even when the incentive came from Rome or a member of the imperial family. This meant that the practice of cult was a very local phenomenon and that communities made decisions based on their own needs and looked to neighboring communities for ideas.

There was also no "canonical list" of the *divi/divae*. Individuals deified in Rome did not always receive cult as individuals in the provinces. The opposite is also true: individuals worshipped in the provinces were not always those officially deified in Rome, and many of these examples date to the earliest development of cult—Gaius and Lucius Caesar, Germanicus, Drusus, and Livia (before her deification). Those *divi/divae* worshipped in the provincial communities as individuals were not always those who had received temples in Rome or even those who were included in later lists of *divi*. In some cases, individuals held multiple priesthoods dedicated to the worship of a number of named *divi*, and many of the priesthoods were granted years after the original deification of the individual, suggesting that connections to particular *divi* were important within the community. However, the surviving evidence suggests that priesthoods were more commonly established to deified emperors rather than members of their family. Only Diva Augusta and Diva Plotina were granted individual priesthoods outside of Italy, and there are no examples of priesthoods dedicated to the worship of deified children. However, the entire imperial family was worshipped as individuals with dedications made to specific individuals throughout the provinces even if each individual was not granted a priesthood. The more common priesthoods of the imperial cult were associated with the collective worship of the imperial family, a phenomenon that highlights the important position of the entire imperial family even if all the individual members were not honored with priesthoods in the Latin West.

Although the surviving evidence is too fragmentary to know for certain, it is likely that priesthoods to individual *divi/divae* were not filled every year but were used in particular circumstances or by particular individuals to draw connections between themselves and specific individual members of the imperial family. The cost to maintain these priesthoods to named *divi/divae* and to find individuals willing to fulfill this role likely affected communities' decisions regarding these priesthoods, and the evidence suggests that

communities more commonly established priesthoods for the collective worship of the imperial family. There were no specific models on which all honors were based. Instead, these models were adopted, adapted, and in some cases abandoned depending on community needs at any given moment. Just because an individual was deified did not mean that he or she would always be commemorated or worshipped as such.

A gender differentiation appears to exist within the priesthoods, with male priests in the provincial communities responsible for overseeing the worship of the *divi* and female priests responsible for overseeing the worship of the *divae* (except in the case of the early development of cult in Lusitania). However, these individuals largely occupied the same positions within their communities except that women could not hold political office. Priests of both genders used their positions to better their communities, their own status, and that of their family through benefaction and commemorative inscriptions. In many cases, these individuals were not necessarily the most powerful individuals in their communities but instead were individuals seeking social mobility and an increase in status through civic benefactions and officeholding. Neither women nor freedmen could hold political office, and although it has been argued in the past that these individuals were largely concerned with increasing the status of their family and offspring, some individuals had less selfless motivations, and these priesthoods brought about an increase in status for the individuals themselves. These priesthoods were accompanied by the granting of various honors and positions within the community, which would increase an individual's visibility and status.

The imperial cult was not only about the emperor. The current shift in terminology for discussing the rituals, temples, priests, and other honors from *imperial cult* to *emperor worship* largely ignores more than half of the individuals deified in Rome and the importance of cult practices paid to the entire imperial family. Individuals in the provinces sought to forge connections not only among themselves, their communities, and the emperor but also to various members of the imperial family. Priesthoods dedicated to the worship of Diva Augusta or Diva Plotina should be understood in the same context as priesthoods of Divus Augustus or Divus Trajan. The imperial power structure was not concentrated entirely in the emperor's hands but instead rested in the hands of the entire imperial family. By establishing cult to the imperial family, communities could be a part of the commemoration and worship of this family of gods that ensured the empire's continued peace and prosperity.

Epilogue

***Aeternae Memoriae*: The Persistence of Imperial Cult Practices in Late Antique North Africa**

In the year 526 CE, Astius Mustelus died and was commemorated in Ammaedara with an inscription.⁴⁸² Complete with the Christian Chi-Rho symbol, this inscription is the latest attestation of the title *flamen perpetuus* in the surviving evidence. If the office of *flamen perpetuus* remained responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family during this period, what does the fact that Mustelus is also a *cristianus* (*sic*) mean? Was there some aspect of the worship of the emperor that does not appear to conflict with the Christian practices of the 5th and 6th centuries CE? Although priesthoods ceased to be established to specific individuals by the 3rd and 4th centuries CE, priesthoods dedicated in some form to the worship of the imperial family persisted well into the 5th and 6th centuries CE. For the purposes of this short epilogue, the discussion focuses on the epigraphic evidence from North Africa.⁴⁸³

The 5th century brought about a series of changes to the political and social landscape of North Africa. Vandals invaded the area, and Carthage ultimately fell to these invaders in 439 CE. The relationship between the Vandals and the Romano-African aristocracy (and Roman government generally) plays a vital role in understanding the public offices held during this period.⁴⁸⁴ Likewise, conflicts between the Donatists and the Catholics were the focus of many of the Christian writings and church councils and provide evidence for the persistence (or not) of earlier religious practices. In many cases, Christian groups were more concerned with their internal conflict than with converting pagans. That said, many ancient shrines were closed, and legislation from the emperors attempted to ban sacrifice in certain areas and in certain contexts.⁴⁸⁵ However, there is clear evidence of the temples being in states of disrepair even before this period.⁴⁸⁶ The legislation against pagans was collected in Book 16 of the Theodosian Code and has been used by modern scholars to argue for the end of paganism.⁴⁸⁷ One of the most important texts for the worship of the imperial family is the Hispellum inscription of 336 CE, although this text may not directly relate to the evidence and events in the provinces of North Africa.⁴⁸⁸ This inscription bans sacrificial practices in the new cult of the *gens Flavia*. Yet the foundation of a temple (*aedes*) and a

priesthood (*sacerdotes*) as well as other religious rites were permitted.⁴⁸⁹ In addition, this cult was permitted by Constantine and his three sons, thereby demonstrating the continued importance of the promotion of the imperial family. Even though the surviving legislation compiled in the Theodosian Code seems to suggest that certain practices relating to the worship of the Roman gods as well as the emperors and their families were banned, commemoration and honors granted to the imperial family continued to play an important role in the sociopolitical landscape of a number of communities throughout the Mediterranean basin.⁴⁹⁰

***Flamen Perpetuus*: Worshipping the Emperors and Their Families**

As Trombley has so convincingly argued, the practice of imperial cult did not significantly change in the period 244–395 CE.⁴⁹¹ Emperors were still being deified (i.e., having the title *divus* added to their names after death), although the practice of deifying family members appears to have ceased. Honorific statues were set up and dedications were made. The office of *flamen perpetuus* persisted, and civic benefaction—an important feature of priesthoods since their conception—continued to play a role in their activities until at least the mid-5th century CE, although this might be a result of other factors rather than the abrupt end of the imperial cult.⁴⁹² However, a few surviving inscriptions from the 6th century suggest that some of the offices associated with the worship of the imperial family persisted well after Theodosian legislation.

Similar to what was found in the earlier periods of worship, only limited surviving evidence shows priests making dedications or overseeing temple constructions for the individuals for whose cults they were responsible.⁴⁹³ Nevertheless, a couple of individual emperors received honors in this group of provinces stretching into Late Antiquity. During the reign of Julian, Flavius Aquilinus, a *flamen perpetuus* and *curator rei publicae*, set up and dedicated an altar to the emperor.⁴⁹⁴ A *sacerdotalis* set up a statue of Gratian.⁴⁹⁵ Although this statue might not have any religious significance, nevertheless, it served to honor the emperor and was set up by a provincial priest dedicated to his worship.⁴⁹⁶ In Gigithi, the governor (Flavius Vivius) made a dedication to the *numen* of Valentinian II.⁴⁹⁷

One of the problems with the title of *flamen perpetuus* is that although it has been most commonly affiliated with the worship of the imperial family, the exact nature of this priesthood and its responsibilities are not clear.⁴⁹⁸ Nevertheless, in some cases the title is qualified with the name of the individual for whose cult the priest is

responsible. This is found in priests of living emperors (such as the *flamen Augusti perpetuus* from Civitas Sivalitana)⁴⁹⁹ as well as named *divi* (Divus Augustus,⁵⁰⁰ Divus Traianus,⁵⁰¹ Divus Hadrianus,⁵⁰² and Divus Magnus Antoninus⁵⁰³).⁵⁰⁴ The title *flamen perpetuus* on its own might reflect a more general cultic responsibility, but it does appear to be a local variation (found predominantly in North Africa) for the titles of the priests of cult paid to the imperial family at a local level.

The latest attestation of the office of *flamen perpetuus* (the inscription that began this epilogue) dates to 526 CE. Some scholars have suggested that by the 5th and 6th centuries, the office of *flamen perpetuus* had undergone a shift and lost its religious function, becoming more like the office of *curator*.⁵⁰⁵ In fact, the offices of *flamen perpetuus* and *curator* are the most frequently attested in the surviving evidence from Late Antique North Africa.⁵⁰⁶ In a number of cases during the imperial period, individuals were both *curator* and *flamen perpetuus* (or some other *flamen* for the worship of the imperial family), which suggests not that these positions became conflated over time but rather that both remained important aspects of a public career.⁵⁰⁷ After the time of Constantine, individuals rarely would hold only the office of *curator*, suggesting that the individuals holding high offices within their communities tended to hold many of these positions throughout their lifetimes. In many cases, these positions included the office of *flamen perpetuus*.⁵⁰⁸

If the offices of *flamen perpetuus* and *curator* were different, what were the responsibilities of these curators? Most of the time curators' responsibilities are mentioned in vague terms of administration. There is evidence that they were responsible for restoring, building, and dedicating buildings or monuments. In short, they seem to play some role in the general overseeing of the physical landscape of the Late Antique city, and during the later period, they appear to assume the functions of the higher magistracies, such as administration, maintaining public order, dispensing justice, and overseeing financial resources.⁵⁰⁹ There were no strictly religious duties associated with this office, and scholars who conflate the office of *flamen perpetuus* and *curator* do so by taking away the *flamen perpetuus*'s religious responsibilities, most of which involve honoring the emperor and the imperial family.

The evidence suggests that civic benefaction was an important part of the office of *flamen perpetuus*, but this does not reflect a change in purpose.⁵¹⁰ Civic benefaction (whether involving buildings and other honors specifically for members of the imperial family or not) played an integral role in the development of cult paid to the emperor and his family in provincial communities.⁵¹¹ The surviving evidence clearly

shows that individuals who held the title *flamen perpetuus* often also held other priesthoods or titles associated with municipal careers, and in many cases, the office of *flamen perpetuus* might have helped increase status or led to political advancement.⁵¹² This civic tradition continued well into the 6th century, with many elites gaining social prestige through their municipal offices and benefactions.⁵¹³

The persistence of the office of *flamen perpetuus* and its role in civic benefaction may be a direct result of the well-documented tradition of patrons and benefactors in the provinces of North Africa.⁵¹⁴ It would be a mistake, however, to ignore the religious aspects of the office of *flamen perpetuus*.⁵¹⁵ This title ultimately refers to a priesthood, regardless of the other civic and administrative duties and benefactions with which it seemed to be associated. However, the title is still ambiguous without its qualifiers and likely reflects a continuation of the worship of the imperial family as a collective, although what this worship entails is not entirely clear.⁵¹⁶

Following the Vandal invasions in the 5th century and the fall of Carthage in 439 CE, North Africa was no longer under the control of the Roman emperor. What, then, was the purpose of an office dedicated to the worship of the emperor when the area itself was no longer under his control? A couple of possible answers exist. First, there is evidence that communities not under Roman control nevertheless chose to honor the emperor and his family members. A coin from Syria dating to sometime after 65 CE celebrates the divinity of Nero's wife and daughter.⁵¹⁷ In this case, a community outside of direct Roman control sought to connect itself with the ruling family through the promotion of its divine members. Second, evidence shows that many Roman administrative structures—most notably the provincial councils—persisted under Vandal control.⁵¹⁸ Since many of these municipal offices played an important role in the promotion of individuals within their communities, it seems likely that many of these offices would persist, at least for a while, even under a new form of governance. If this is the case and the office of *flamen perpetuus* continues to play a role in municipal organization, its persistence may result from habit and the continued importance of certain influential families rather than constitute an explicit statement against the new rulers.

Flamen Perpetuus et Christianus: A Conflict of Ideas?

Much of the debate surrounding the persistence of the worship of the imperial family has centered on whether its practices conflicted with Christianity. Although scholars have taken the antipagan legislation in

the Theodosian Code to mark the end of sacrifice and pagan practices, the answer is not as well defined as one might hope.⁵¹⁹ Not only did the legislation in the code refer to very localized and specific situations, but ways to enforce this legislation in provincial communities were limited.⁵²⁰ In some cases, ancient shrines continued to operate throughout the 5th and 6th centuries, regardless of the various pieces of legislation.⁵²¹ This is based on tradition and follows on the earlier practices of local initiative. There are issues of authority over shrines found on private land and how the acts legislated would have been carried out.⁵²² The antiquity of many of the buildings and statues also complicated matters, as many Christians had a positive attitude toward them, especially as temples were maintained to display art rather than to serve a religious purpose.⁵²³

Worship of the imperial family was clearly flexible, with practices adopted and adapted by communities in different ways. The worship of the emperor and his family became an important part of the aristocratic values and life, aspects of which remained important even after many aristocrats converted to Christianity. Priesthoods were a way to demonstrate and gain power and prestige.⁵²⁴ The position of the emperor and how he was perceived by those living in the empire also varied over time. Although it has been argued that during the Christian period the emperor was no longer perceived as being a god himself but as divinely elected and a servant of the Christian God on earth, this concept is not new.⁵²⁵ The idea of divine election of the emperor can be traced back to the Roman republic.⁵²⁶ The importance of honoring the emperor and his family did not change; all that changed were the ways in which he was worshipped.

There are six surviving references to priests of the imperial cult in the 5th and 6th centuries,⁵²⁷ with three references to *flamines perpetui* and three to *sacerdotes* (provincial priests). Three of these inscriptions from the community of Ammaedara are noteworthy for this discussion.⁵²⁸ A fragmentary inscription (heavily restored) reads, *Astius Vindicianus, vir clarissimus et flamen perpetuus*.⁵²⁹ The inscription includes the Chi-Rho symbol, and nothing is known about this individual except that he held the office of *flamen perpetuus* and was a member of the elite in his community. Although not directly related to the current discussion, an inscription commemorating Astius Dinamius, a relation of Astius Mustelus, also survives from this community.⁵³⁰ Dinamius is a *sacerdotalis provinciae Africae*. This is the title for priests responsible for overseeing the worship of the imperial family at a provincial level from the 2nd century CE onward.⁵³¹ It demonstrates that worship of the imperial family at a provincial level persisted even during this late period and may be a result of the continued importance of the provincial councils. The inscription that

began this epilogue memorializes Astius Mustelus, a relation (although the specific relationship is not known) of Astius Vindicianus and Astius Dinamius.⁵³² Unlike the other qualifiers found with *flamen perpetuus* (such as *flamen divi Augusti perpetuus* discussed earlier) *christianus* in this case does not constitute a qualifier for the office of *flamen perpetuus*. Astius Mustelus is not a Christian *flamen perpetuus* (in other words, a *flamen perpetuus* of the Christian God), somehow linking the traditional role of this priesthood with some religious function outside of the traditional church hierarchy. Instead, he is a *flamen perpetuus* and a *christianus*. Unlike many of the other inscriptions from this period, especially the two inscriptions of his family members, Mustelus not only labeled himself with the traditional Chi-Rho symbol but also explicitly identified himself as *christianus*.

The Chi-Rho symbol became an important feature on tombstones and honorary inscriptions of Christians, but the label *christianus* is relatively rare, and the spelling of the term varies greatly.⁵³³ Very few of these individuals held municipal offices, and Aurelius Melitius was commemorated as a *cristaeanus* (*sic*) *fidelis* at the age of four. Why individuals sought to label themselves as *christianus* in addition to the Chi-Rho symbol is unclear, but the fact that Mustelus chose to make a clear statement by labeling himself as *christianus* while also holding the office of *flamen perpetuus* seems to suggest that these two titles were not at odds with each other.

This family from Ammaedara closely mirrors a family of priests from the mid- to late 4th century CE. Around 361–363 CE, Basilius Cirrenianus held the provincial priesthood for the worship of the emperor (*sacerdotalis*).⁵³⁴ A relation, Quintus Basilius Flaccianus, was *flamen perpetuus* and *augur* a few years later and made a dedication to Valentinian.⁵³⁵ Finally, Basilius Cirrenianus was *flamen perpetuus* in 373 CE.⁵³⁶ As has been the case throughout the imperial period, both the imperial family and the family of the priest played important roles in the establishment and persistence of cult practice. Thus it is not surprising, even with the limited evidence, that these priesthoods were held by multiple members of the same family group, although it should not be concluded that these priesthoods were hereditary. Instead, as one would expect, certain influential members of society and their family members tended to be the likeliest candidates for these high municipal (and provincial) offices. Although it is unclear whether these individuals were Christians like the Astii, they still demonstrate the persistence of both provincial and municipal cult practices associated with the worship of the emperor and its importance within the landscape of the community.

Although the practices associated with the imperial cult changed over time, the position of the priests, and their roles in their communities remained integral to the civic, political, and religious landscape. Priesthoods continued to be used to draw connections to the emperor and his family. These offices also promoted the individuals who held them as well as increased the prestige of their entire families. Religious honors granted to individuals could change focus over time, but the commemoration of the imperial family remained important in the life of the Ancient Roman city well into Late Antiquity.

Appendix 1

Municipal Priests (Male) Dedicated to the Worship of Individual *Divi*

Community	Dedication to	Dedicated by	Date (CE)	Reference
GAULS				
Narbonensis				
AE 1904.15.42	Augustus	Arelatensium		
AE 1904.15.50	Augustus	(<i>Flavia</i>) et <i>Flavia</i> (<i>lis</i>)		
AE 1904.15.51	Augustus	Alindarta		
AE 1904.16.40	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.43	Augustus	et genius coloniae Nemausi		
AE 1904.16.44	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.45	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.46	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.47	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.48	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.49	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.50	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.51	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.52	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.53	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.54	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.55	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.56	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.57	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.58	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.59	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.60	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.61	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.62	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.63	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.64	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.65	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.66	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.67	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.68	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.69	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.70	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.71	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.72	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.73	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.74	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.75	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.76	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.77	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.78	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.79	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.80	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.81	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.82	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.83	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.84	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.85	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.86	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.87	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.88	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.89	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.90	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.91	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.92	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.93	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.94	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.95	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.96	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.97	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.98	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.16.99	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.00	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.01	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.02	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.03	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.04	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.05	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.06	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.07	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.08	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.09	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.10	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.11	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
AE 1904.17.12	Augustus	(<i>usta</i>)		
Aquitania				
AE 1904.16.99	Augustus, Minerva, et Diva Drusilla	Avantium Biturum		
Belgica				
AE 1904.17.04	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.05	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.06	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.07	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.08	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.09	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.10	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.11	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.12	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.13	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.14	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.15	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.16	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.17	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.18	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.19	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.20	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.21	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.22	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.23	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.24	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.25	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.26	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.27	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.28	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.29	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.30	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.31	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.32	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.33	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.34	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.35	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.36	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.37	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.38	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.39	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.40	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.41	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.42	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.43	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.44	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.45	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.46	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.47	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.48	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.49	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.50	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.51	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.52	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.53	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.54	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.55	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.56	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.57	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.58	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.59	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.60	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.61	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.62	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.63	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.64	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.65	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.66	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.67	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.68	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.69	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.70	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.71	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.72	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.73	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.74	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.75	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.76	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.77	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.78	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.79	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.80	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.81	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.82	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.83	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.84	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.85	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.86	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.87	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.88	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.89	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.90	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.91	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.92	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.93	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.94	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.95	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.96	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.97	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.98	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.17.99	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.00	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.01	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.02	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.03	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.04	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.05	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.06	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.07	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.08	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.09	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.10	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.11	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.12	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.13	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.14	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.15	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.16	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.17	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.18	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.19	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.20	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.21	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.22	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.23	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.24	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.25	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.26	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.27	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.28	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.29	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.30	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.31	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.32	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.33	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.34	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.35	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.36	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.37	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.38	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.39	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.40	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.41	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.42	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.43	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.44	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.45	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.46	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.47	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.48	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.49	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.50	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.51	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.52	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.53	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.54	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.55	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.56	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.57	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.58	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.59	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.60	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.61	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.62	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.63	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.64	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.65	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.66	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.67	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.68	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.69	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.70	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.71	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.72	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.73	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.74	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.75	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.76	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.77	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.78	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.79	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.80	Augustus	Augusta		
AE 1904.18.81	Augustus	Augusta		

~~AD 155-156~~ (Augustus)

~~AD 156-157~~

~~AD 157-158~~

~~AD 158-159~~

~~AD 159-160~~

~~AD 160-161~~

~~AD 161-162~~

~~AD 162-163~~

~~AD 163-164~~

~~AD 164-165~~

~~AD 165-166~~

~~AD 166-167~~

~~AD 167-168~~

~~AD 168-169~~

~~AD 169-170~~

~~AD 170-171~~

~~AD 171-172~~

~~AD 172-173~~

~~AD 173-174~~

~~AD 174-175~~

~~AD 175-176~~

~~AD 176-177~~

~~AD 177-178~~

~~AD 178-179~~

~~AD 179-180~~

~~AD 180-181~~

~~AD 181-182~~

~~AD 182-183~~

~~AD 183-184~~

~~AD 184-185~~

~~AD 185-186~~

~~AD 186-187~~

~~AD 187-188~~

~~AD 188-189~~

~~AD 189-190~~

~~AD 190-191~~

~~AD 191-192~~

~~AD 192-193~~

~~AD 193-194~~

~~AD 194-195~~

~~AD 195-196~~

~~AD 196-197~~

~~AD 197-198~~

~~AD 198-199~~

~~AD 199-200~~

~~AD 200-201~~

~~AD 201-202~~

~~AD 202-203~~

~~AD 203-204~~

~~AD 204-205~~

~~AD 205-206~~

~~AD 206-207~~

~~AD 207-208~~

~~AD 208-209~~

~~AD 209-210~~

~~AD 210-211~~

~~AD 211-212~~

~~AD 212-213~~

~~AD 213-214~~

~~AD 214-215~~

~~AD 215-216~~

~~AD 216-217~~

~~AD 217-218~~

~~AD 218-219~~

~~AD 219-220~~

~~AD 220-221~~

~~AD 221-222~~

~~AD 222-223~~

~~AD 223-224~~

~~AD 224-225~~

~~AD 225-226~~

~~AD 226-227~~

~~AD 227-228~~

~~AD 228-229~~

~~AD 229-230~~

~~AD 230-231~~

~~AD 231-232~~

~~AD 232-233~~

~~AD 233-234~~

~~AD 234-235~~

~~AD 235-236~~

~~AD 236-237~~

~~AD 237-238~~

~~AD 238-239~~

~~AD 239-240~~

~~AD 240-241~~

~~AD 241-242~~

~~AD 242-243~~

~~AD 243-244~~

~~AD 244-245~~

~~AD 245-246~~

~~AD 246-247~~

~~AD 247-248~~

~~AD 248-249~~

~~AD 249-250~~

~~AD 250-251~~

~~AD 251-252~~

~~AD 252-253~~

~~AD 253-254~~

~~AD 254-255~~

~~AD 255-256~~

~~AD 256-257~~

~~AD 257-258~~

~~AD 258-259~~

~~AD 259-260~~

~~AD 260-261~~

~~AD 261-262~~

~~AD 262-263~~

~~AD 263-264~~

~~AD 264-265~~

~~AD 265-266~~

~~AD 266-267~~

~~AD 267-268~~

~~AD 268-269~~

~~AD 269-270~~

~~AD 270-271~~

~~AD 271-272~~

~~AD 272-273~~

~~AD 273-274~~

~~AD 274-275~~

~~AD 275-276~~

~~AD 276-277~~

~~AD 277-278~~

~~AD 278-279~~

~~AD 279-280~~

~~AD 280-281~~

~~AD 281-282~~

~~AD 282-283~~

~~AD 283-284~~

~~AD 284-285~~

~~AD 285-286~~

~~AD 286-287~~

~~AD 287-288~~

~~AD 288-289~~

~~AD 289-290~~

~~AD 290-291~~

~~AD 291-292~~

~~AD 292-293~~

~~AD 293-294~~

~~AD 294-295~~

~~AD 295-296~~

~~AD 296-297~~

~~AD 297-298~~

~~AD 298-299~~

~~AD 299-300~~

~~AD 300-301~~

~~AD 301-302~~

~~AD 302-303~~

~~AD 303-304~~

~~AD 304-305~~

~~AD 305-306~~

~~AD 306-307~~

~~AD 307-308~~

~~AD 308-309~~

~~AD 309-310~~

~~AD 310-311~~

~~AD 311-312~~

~~AD 312-313~~

~~AD 313-314~~

~~AD 314-315~~

~~AD 315-316~~

~~AD 316-317~~

~~AD 317-318~~

~~AD 318-319~~

~~AD 319-320~~

~~AD 320-321~~

~~AD 321-322~~

~~AD 322-323~~

~~AD 323-324~~

~~AD 324-325~~

~~AD 325-326~~

~~AD 326-327~~

~~AD 327-328~~

~~AD 328-329~~

~~AD 329-330~~

~~AD 330-331~~

~~AD 331-332~~

~~AD 332-333~~

~~AD 333-334~~

~~AD 334-335~~

~~AD 335-336~~

~~AD 336-337~~

~~AD 337-338~~

~~AD 338-339~~

~~AD 339-340~~

~~AD 340-341~~

~~AD 341-342~~

~~AD 342-343~~

~~AD 343-344~~

~~AD 344-345~~

~~AD 345-346~~

~~AD 346-347~~

~~AD 347-348~~

~~AD 348-349~~

~~AD 349-350~~

~~AD 350-351~~

~~AD 351-352~~

~~AD 352-353~~

~~AD 353-354~~

~~AD 354-355~~

~~AD 355-356~~

~~AD 356-357~~

~~AD 357-358~~

~~AD 358-359~~

~~AD 359-360~~

~~AD 360-361~~

~~AD 361-362~~

~~AD 362-363~~

~~AD 363-364~~

~~AD 364-365~~

~~AD 365-366~~

~~AD 366-367~~

~~AD 367-368~~

~~AD 368-369~~

~~AD 369-370~~

~~AD 370-371~~

~~AD 371-372~~

~~AD 372-373~~

~~AD 373-374~~

~~AD 374-375~~

~~AD 375-376~~

~~AD 376-377~~

~~AD 377-378~~

~~AD 378-379~~

~~AD 379-380~~

~~AD 380-381~~

~~AD 381-382~~

~~AD 382-383~~

~~AD 383-384~~

~~AD 384-385~~

~~AD 385-386~~

~~AD 386-387~~

~~AD 387-388~~

~~AD 388-389~~

~~AD 389-390~~

~~AD 390-391~~

~~AD 391-392~~

~~AD 392-393~~

~~AD 393-394~~

~~AD 394-395~~

~~AD 395-396~~

~~AD 396-397~~

~~AD 397-398~~

~~AD 398-399~~

~~AD 399-400~~

~~AD 400-401~~

~~AD 401-402~~

~~AD 402-403~~

~~AD 403-404~~

~~AD 404-405~~

~~AD 405-406~~

~~AD 406-407~~

~~AD 407-408~~

~~AD 408-409~~

~~AD 409-410~~

~~AD 410-411~~

~~AD 411-412~~

~~AD 412-413~~

~~AD 413-414~~

~~AD 414-415~~

~~AD 415-416~~

~~AD 416-417~~

~~AD 417-418~~

~~AD 418-419~~

~~AD 419-420~~

~~AD 420-421~~

~~AD 421-422~~

~~AD 422-423~~

~~AD 423-424~~

~~AD 424-425~~

~~AD 425-426~~

~~AD 426-427~~

~~AD 427-428~~

~~AD 428-429~~

~~AD 429-430~~

~~AD 430-431~~

~~AD 431-432~~

~~AD 432-433~~

~~AD 433-434~~

~~AD 434-435~~

~~AD 435-436~~

~~AD 436-437~~

~~AD 437-438~~

~~AD 438-439~~

~~AD 439-440~~

~~AD 440-441~~

~~AD 441-442~~

~~AD 442-443~~

Appendix 2

Municipal Priestesses (Female) Dedicated to the Worship of Individual *Divae*

Community / Priestess	Title	Date (CE)	Reference
THE SPAINS			
Baetica			
CHL 10.1979 [Chloris] divae Augustae]			
THE GAULS			
Narbonensis			
CHL 10.1982 [Chloris] divae Augustae			
CHL 10.1986 [Chloris] divae Aug(ustae)			
NORTH AFRICA			
Africa			
Proconsularis			
CHL 5.1988 [Chloris] divae Plotinae			
CHL 5.1994 [Chloris] divae Augustae			

Appendix 3

Dedications Made to the Gods by *Augustales

Community /	Priest	Title	Date (CE)	Reference
Find Spot THE SPAINS				
Tarraconensis				
Mile 202176	Vicentius	Patrician	1217	
Mile 202176	Eusebius	III rd	1139	
Mile 202176	Sedech	I st	1132	
Mile 202176	Vespasianus	Novatianus		
Mile 202176	Prothadius			
Lusitania				
Mile 202176	Aurelius	Mucius		
Mile 202176	Ser(vius) Modestus			
Baetica				
Mile 202176	Julio			
Mile 202176	Claudio	II nd		
Mile 202176	Nugubianus			
Mile 202176	Nugubianus			
NORTH AFRICA				
Africa				
Proconsularis				
Mile 202176	Gaius	Datus		
Mile 202176	Gallianus			
Mile 202176	Adrianus	#15		
Mile 202176	(Simplicius)			
Mile 202176	Quadratus			
Mile 202176	Extricationus			
Mile 202176	Victorinus			
Mile 202176	Felix Octavianus			
Mile 202176	Antonini			
Mile 202176	Severus			
Mile 202176	Messius	Thianus		

Footnotes

1. Gradel 2002, 52.
2. Price 1984b, 231.
3. Price (1987, 57) lists the total number as sixty-three—thirty-six emperors and twenty-seven members of the imperial family. However, the evidence for these deifications is more secure in some cases than in others.
4. By using the term *imperial cult*, I am not suggesting that there was a universal practice that contained a set collection of rituals accepted wholesale throughout the empire. I instead follow Bendlin's (1997, 45) interpretation of *emperor worship*, which highlights the different ways in which worship of the emperor was affected by whether cult practices were established at the provincial or municipal level, by the geographical location of the communities, and by how these practices interacted with existing practices. I use *imperial cult* instead of *emperor worship* or *ruler cult* to highlight the importance of worship to other members of the family beyond the emperor. Brodd and Reed (2011) have also chosen to use the term *imperial cult* for their edited volume on the subject, although many of the chapters use *emperor worship* to denote the collection of cultic practices.
5. Scholars have argued about the possible practices on which the act of deification was modeled. Price (1984b, 23–52) summarizes a number of these hypotheses. This practice has aspects based on Greek hero cult, but it has also been argued that it spread partly because it drew on existing traditions of ruler worship found throughout the empire. For an example of this type of discussion for the Iberian Peninsula, see Étienne 1958, chap. 1.
6. For a discussion focused on its religious purpose, see Clauss 1999.
7. Gesche 1978, 381–83. The deification of an individual is almost more important for those left behind who can draw a connection to that individual (Davies 2000; Heckster 2009, 2015; Price 1987). For the political uses of *divi filius* by Octavian, see Ramage 1985; H. Whittaker 1996. Deification was also a useful way of legitimizing successors who had been adopted into the family (specifically in the case of the Antonine dynasty). A similar use of deification can be found in Septimius Severus's contest for power, where he claimed to be the son of Marcus Aurelius and deified his “brother” Commodus in order to be the *divi frater* and to connect himself with his other newly adopted divine family (*CIL* 8.25379). This has most recently been discussed in Hekster 2015; see also Gagé 1931.
8. Weinstock 1971; most recently, see Gradel 2002.
9. The discussion of divinity as “relative” has been presented most recently by Gradel (2002). Cole (2013) presents evidence suggesting that divinity could be earned through deeds, as outlined in Cicero's orations, letters, and philosophical works. Levene (2012) has argued against this model, stating that divinity was not a relative category but an absolute one. Men could not “become” gods, and the transgressive nature of the imperial cult occurred in specific contexts where that division could be “overlooked.”
10. Price 1984b.
11. See McIntyre 2013.
12. Price 1984b, 7–8.

13. One such example is Gradel 2002, which focuses specifically on Italy. Friesen (1993) expands Price's discussion of Asia but examines only one particular family, the Flavians. An earlier geographical study of the Iberian Peninsula was done by Étienne (1958). He has also written more recent studies on the earliest development of these cults with relation to civic temple buildings (Étienne 1996) and provincial priests (Étienne 1999) that take into consideration some of Price's conclusions. Rives (2001b) wrote a short article on the imperial cult in North Africa. Smadja (1978, 1985, 1998, 2005a, b) has done a great deal of work on cult in these provinces. Derks (1998) and van Andringa (2002) have focused on cult practices in the provinces of Gaul. For a collection of case studies of cults in specific communities, see Small 1996.
14. Várhelyi (2010, esp. chap. 4) examines the position of individuals in the provinces and the use of provincial offices and priesthoods that then led to positions within the city of Rome. Christol (2006) stresses the way in which dedicants can define their own identities and positions within the power structure through the dedications they make. For the role of religion in communicating power relationships between Rome and the provinces and specifically the local initiative and elite self-promotion, see Bendlin 1997; Noreña 2011.
15. As Beard, North, and Price (1998, 1:348) rightly argue, there was no such thing as *the* imperial cult. Instead, they stress the diversity of the localized cult practices related to the worship of the emperor.
16. Scholars have examined the importance of family relations during Augustus's reign and the shift from republic to empire (see esp. Severy 2003) or the women of the Antonine period (Boatwright 1991). A number of case studies have explored specific members of the family (mostly women) and discussed their exceptional and divine honors, but these works rarely put these honors into the context of those granted to emperors and other family members (see, for example, Kokkinos 1992; Levick 2007). Purcell's (1986) article puts many of the honors granted to Livia into their historical context in an attempt to explain the exceptional status of this woman during her lifetime but does not discuss in detail her deification and its context. Friesen's (1993) work focuses on the imperial cult (including all members of the family) for one particular family, the Flavians. However, these discussions do not tend to focus on a comprehensive examination of the worship of imperial family members as gods or how these practices changed over time. A few specific case studies examine particular *divae* but rarely expand their discussions to include comparisons between similar honors granted to other members of the family or how these honors changed over time (Bickerman 1974; Herz 1981; Wood 1995).
17. Várhelyi 2010.
18. Most recently in Hemelrijk 2015, but see also Hemelrijk 2005, 2006a, b, 2007, 2009, 2013.
19. Noreña 2011.
20. Both Étienne (1958) and Price (1984b) discuss possible native precedents for these cults in their respective areas. However, the designation of these individuals as a *divus* or *diva* is a purely Roman innovation.
21. The Greek influence, specifically Hellenistic ruler cult, has been clearly expressed in L. R. Taylor's (1931) foundational work on the subject of Roman ruler cult, which focuses on its development under Julius Caesar and Augustus. Cole (2013, with relevant bibliography) has argued that the Hellenistic ideology was brought to Rome and adapted to suit the political needs of the late republic through Cicero's speeches and philosophical writings. For a discussion on Roman adoption of Greek ideology, see Lozano 2007. Beard, North, and Price (1998, 1:349) have argued that the

distinction between the eastern and western parts of the empire relates to the voluntary nature of participation in the East, while participation in the West was imposed by Rome. However, Madsen (2009, 40–45) has argued that the emperor and Roman authorities played an important role in how cult was established in the East, especially early establishment of cult of Augustus in the Bithynia/Pontus region.

22. Hekster (2015, 319) argues that neither a top-down nor a bottom-up model provides an accurate representation of the way in which ideas were communicated throughout the empire (specifically in terms of imperial ancestry and constructions of the imperial family). See also Bendlin 1997; Chaniotis 2009. Cf. Christol (2006, 13), who argues that since public cult should be understood within the context of political interactions, it must therefore be imposed from the center. Cooley (2006, 228–30) has also stressed the development of a new imperial culture through the blending of different practices and a delicate balance between revitalization and innovation.
23. Chaniotis 2009, 29.
24. Fishwick states this explicitly in the introduction to *ICLW* 3.1 (4), where he says that there was no pre-Roman belief in the divinity of the ruler (with a few minor exceptions) and that there was no administrative framework that allowed these cults to be spontaneously adopted. Instead, he argues that the cult in the West was largely influenced and designed by the emperor himself. For a discussion of whether religious communication in the Roman empire should be discussed in terms of core-periphery models, see Bendlin 1997.
25. For the Gauls, see Derks 1998; Drinkwater 1983; van Andringa 1999; Woolf 1998. For the Spains, see Mackie 1983; Richardson 1986, 1996. For Africa, see Bénabou 1976; Law 1978; Manton 1988; Mattingly and Hitchner 1995; Raven 1993; Rives 1995; C. R. Whittaker 1996.
26. For Spain, see Alföldy 1973 (for a discussion on provincial priests); Étienne 1958. For Gaul, see Derks 1998; van Andringa 2002. No comprehensive book has been written about the imperial cult in Africa, but a number of articles have broadened our understanding of cult practices in this area (see Rives 2001b; Smadja 2005a). Bassignano (1974) discusses and lists the provincial priests found in North Africa.
27. According to the extremely problematic *Scriptores Historia Augusta*, the Senate attempted to prevent Hadrian's deification, but Antoninus Pius nevertheless secured it (SHA. *Had.* 27.2–4). For a discussion of the role of the Senate in deification, see Gradel 2002, 261–371.
28. Price 1987, 78. For detailed discussions of the “divine funeral,” see Hekster 2009, 95–110; Price 1987, 56–105. Richard (1978) also addresses this topic but is less comprehensive. There is surviving literary evidence for the funerals of Augustus (Cass.Dio 56.34.1–4), Pertinax (Cass.Dio 75.4.2–5.5), Septimius Severus (Hdn. 4.2.1–11), and Drusilla (Cass.Dio 59.11.1–4), whose funeral, according to Cassius Dio, followed a similar pattern to the emperors' funerals and deifications. For a discussion of the ritual of *consecratio*, see Bickerman 1973.
29. For a discussion of some of the issues with the primary sources for understanding municipal worship in Italy and specifically the establishment of cult sites in Ephesus and in Nicaea according to Cass.Dio 51.20.6–8 and Suet. *Aug.* 52, see Gradel 2002, 73–77.
30. Some scholars have argued that a provincial community was organized around the temple associated with the worship of the emperor and members of his family (see Trillmich and Zanker 1990), while others have argued that particular nonreligious buildings (for example, theaters) may have also served some function in the

promotion and worship of the imperial family (Gros 1990, 381–90).

31. Trombley 2011, 21.

32. For an excellent presentation of the difficulty of reconstructing religious practice from inscriptions, see Haensch 2007, 176–87. Rives 2001a also discusses the use of epigraphic evidence for the study of religion. For an excellent summary of the problems associated with epigraphic evidence as a source, see Collar 2013, 65–67 (with relevant bibliography).

33. MacMullen 1982; Meyer 1990.

34. Over time, these divine ancestry lists stretched to an impressive length. For example, Caracalla traced his ancestry all the way back to Divus Nerva (*CIL* 8.25808 [Furnos, Africa Proconsularis]).

35. Livia became the first priest of Augustus (Cass.Dio 56.46.1), and following this precedent, most of the *flamines* of the *divi/divae* in Rome were members of the imperial family. See, for example, SHA. *Marc.* 7.11: et laudavere uterque pro rostris patrem flaminemque ei ex adfinibus et sodales ex amicissimis Aurelianos creavere (Both [Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus] praised their father [Antoninus Pius] from the Rostra, and they appointed a *flamen* for him from their own kinsmen and a college of Aurelian priests [*sodales*] from their closest friends).

36. Some examples of recent work on the imperial family include Rawson 2003; Rowe 2002; Severy 2003; and articles published in a special issue of the *American Journal of Philology* (1999) that was dedicated specifically to the *Senatus consultum de Gn. Piso Patre* and the ideology of the imperial family.

37. The idea of “becoming Roman” was first posited by Woolf in his study of Gaul (1998). Most recently, Revell’s monograph (2009), which was derived from her doctoral thesis, examines the question of local identities and the provincial experience of being “Roman.”

38. A wide spectrum of arguments have explored the nature of this involvement from the center, ranging from all-out imposition on unwilling subjects (Webster 1997, 331–32); to local elites serving to represent Roman political power, thereby arguing for central control through local intermediaries (Christol 2006); to a more dynamic interaction (C. R. Whittaker 1997, 148–52). Hopkins (1978) suggests that worship of the emperor marked to people living in the provinces that they were part of the Roman empire and united scattered communities. Fishwick (*ICLW*) argues that the worship of the imperial family was imposed by Rome in the West, an assumption most recently reiterated in Revell 2009, 90, although she hints that it might not be as forced as has been assumed and may in fact be a blend of both central control and provincial practice. However, she does not go into detail regarding the nature of this blending or how it was manifested in the provinces.

39. Suet. *Cl.* 2.1; Strabo 4.3.2; Cass.Dio 54.32.1.

40. This example is cited as evidence of central control in Fishwick, *ICLW* 3.3, 105–28 (also in Fishwick, *ICLW* 3.1, 9–19, 1.1, 102–30; Fishwick 1996, 96; and many of his earlier works). The example has most recently been discussed in Revell 2009, 90.

41. Rüpke (1997, 13–14) suggests that the best place to look for *Reichsreligion* is through the communication surrounding the establishment of cult, asking questions such as who is initiating the communication and who organizes and controls that communication.

42. Such as Germanicus and Drusus. It also examines cult paid to living individuals (such as Livia and Tiberius) and cult paid to individuals after their death but before their official deification (for example, Livia).

43. This connection, which is traditionally drawn to Hellenistic ruler cult, has been

- analyzed in detail by Bosworth 1999 (in connection with the *Res Gestae* and Virgil's *Aeneid*).
44. For discussions of female priests, see Hemerijk 2005, 2006a, b, 2007, 2009. For prosopographical analysis of provincial priests with some discussion of their municipal offices, see Fishwick, *ICLW* 3.1–3.3. For priests in Africa, see Bassignano 1974. For the most recent discussion of the role of provincial priesthoods in securing senatorial status for one's offspring, see Várhelyi 2010.
 45. This has been addressed by Price (1984b, 10–11), who suggests that the concept of belief is a Christianizing anachronism. King (2003, with relevant bibliography) argues for the applicability of the word *belief* for explaining some aspects of the Roman religious experience.
 46. The basic framework for discussing Roman religion has been outlined in Collar 2013, which is largely based on Scheid 2003. This framework continues in the tradition of Price and does not consider the question of *belief*, but this results from the nature of the evidence for her study rather than a rejection of the usefulness of discussing belief within the context of Roman religious practices.
 47. Weinstock (1971) sets up Caesar as a religious reformer, with all his reforms focusing on and leading up to his own ultimate deification. His analysis focuses on an examination of precedents for honors granted to Caesar and the religious and political significance of those honors. For further discussion of some of the problems associated with this book, see North 1975. Wardle (2009, 107) argues for the opposite interpretation, stating that the honors granted to Caesar were largely an attempt by the Senate to find appropriate ways to celebrate his achievements rather than a carefully planned progression, skillfully orchestrated by Caesar himself. See also Cole 2013, 111–34; Gradel 2002, 54–72; see Fishwick, *ICLW* 1.1, 56–72.
 48. This distinction is explored in Koortbojian 2013, 21–49.
 49. Cass.Dio 43.14.6.
 50. Fishwick, *ICLW* 1.1, 57. Weinstock (1971, 53) dismisses any attempt to reconstruct this inscription as purely speculation and creates a list of possibilities, including *Deo Caesari*, *Deo Invicto*, *Divo Iulio*, or *Genio Caesaris*.
 51. Gradel 2002, 63.
 52. Gradel 2002, 64. Such as in the case of Cassius Dio's version of Tiberius's funeral oration for Augustus, which states that Tiberius made Augustus a ἥρωας and declared him immortal (Cass.Dio 56.41.9). One possible issue with this interpretation is Cassius Dio's use of ἥρωας in the context of Caesar's funeral and honors granted to him after his death (Cass.Dio 47.18.1–19.3). The timeline for the granting of the title *divus* and Caesar's official deification is extremely complicated, as many of the ancient sources contradict one another.
 53. Gradel 2002, 65.
 54. “Bad” emperors who strove to gain divine honors during their lifetimes are referred to as *deus* (for example, Domitian is addressed as *Dominus et Deus*, [Suet. *Dom.* 13.2]).
 55. Serv. A. 5.45 (quoting and opposing Varro *Ling. Lat.* fr. 424). Text from Varro fr. 424 section in Funaioli 1907. Varro's opinion is that *deus* is the term used for all gods and *divus* is an ancient term (Varro, *Ling. Lat.* fr.1., preserved in Serv. A. 12.139.): *Deus autem vel dea generale nomen est omnibus. . . . Varro ad Ciceronem tertio: “Ita respondeant cur dicant deos, cum <de> omnibus antiqui dixerint divos.* (However, *deus* [god] or *dea* [goddess] is a general name for all. . . . Varro, in the third book to Cicero, says: “So let them give answer why they say *dei* [gods], when concerning all of them the ancient Romans used to say *divi*.”).

56. Serv. A. 5.45; Gradel 2002, 65. The modern discussion relating to the terms *divus* and *deus* is concerned with the nature of cult practice for these individuals. Bowerstock (1973, 182–84) argues that the distinction between a *deus* and a *divus* is that deified emperors do not hear prayers or effect supernatural miracles. Price (1984a, 90–93) responds to this distinction by demonstrating that this is not the case. Emperors (both dead and living) received prayers.
57. Wardle (2002) argues that Cicero’s philosophical works played a key role in the development of this term and that this term was used to denote the deified Caesar because it was perceived as the more archaic of the two nouns for *god* and was the one more appropriate to laws.
58. Cic.*Phil.* 2.110 (published sometime in November or December 44 BCE Ramsey 2003, 158]): *est ergo flamen, ut Ioui, ut Marti, ut Quirino, sic diuo Iulio M. Antonius* (As Jupiter, as Mars, as Quirinus each has a *flamen*, so Divus Julius has Mark Antony).
59. Cass.Dio 43.21.2.
60. Christol (1999, 12–13) discusses the terminology relating to Caesar’s divinity in the reconstruction of a fragmentary inscription from Arles (AE 1952, 169). Here, he is arguing for a reconstruction of a priestly title as *flamen Romae et [Aug(usti)] Caesar[is]* (a title found in other inscriptions) instead of *flamen Romae et [divi] Caesar[is]* (the only example of such a priesthood).
61. These included the granting of *imperator* as one of his names, the co-opting of the Parilia to celebrate Caesar’s victory, the honor of wearing triumphal garb at all the games, a public house, the consulship for ten years, and the promise that he alone would have soldiers and administer public funds (Cass.Dio 43.42.3–45.2). Finally, and most important for the purposes of this study, καὶ τότε μὲν ἀνδριάντα αὐτοῦ ἐλεφάντινον, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ἄρμα ὅλον ἐν ταῖς ἱπποδρομίαις μετὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀγαλμάτων πέμπεσθαι ἔγνωσαν. ἄλλην τέ τινα εἰκόνα ἐς τὸν τοῦ Κυρίνου ναὸν θεῶ ἀνικήτῳ ἐπιγράψαντες, καὶ ἄλλην ἐς τὸ Καπιτώλιον παρὰ τοὺς βασιλεύσαντάς ποτε ἐν τῇ Ρώμῃ ἀνέθεσαν. (And at that time, they decreed that an ivory statue and later that a whole chariot should be carried in procession with the statues of the gods in the games in the Circus. They set up another image in the temple of Quirinus, inscribed “to the unconquerable god,” and another on the Capitol beside the former kings in Rome.) (Cass.Dio 43.45.2–3). For a discussion of how the *pompa circensis* became a means to promote imperial family members, specifically those who had been deified, see Arena 2009.
62. Fishwick, *ICLW* 1.1, 59.
63. Arena 2009. The images of Marcellus, Germanicus, and Drusus (and likely Lucius and Gaius Caesar) were all included in the procession, and the exceptional honors granted to each of these successors were modeled on those granted previously, with Marcellus’s honors following on those granted to Caesar.
64. Fishwick, *ICLW* 1.1, 61, argues that this honor further connects Caesar with Romulus and expands on the honors granted in 45 BCE.
65. Cass.Dio 44.6.2–3.
66. Cass.Dio 44.6.4: καὶ τέλος Δία τε αὐτὸν ἄντικρυς Ἰούλιον προσηγόρευσαν, καὶ ναὸν αὐτῷ τῇ τ’ Ἐπεικειά αὐτοῦ τεμενισθῆναι ἔγνωσαν, ἱερέα σφίσι τὸν Ἀντώνιον ὥσπερ τινὰ Διάλιον προχειρισάμενοι (And finally, they addressed him openly as Jupiter Julius and decreed that a temple be consecrated to him and his clemency, choosing Mark Antony as their priest like some *flamen Dialis*). The use of this priesthood as a model is discussed further in chap. 3. The temple to his clemency is also mentioned in Plut. *Caes* 57.3 and is depicted on a coin dating to April (RRC I, 491 n. 21; Fishwick, *ICLW* 1.1, 62).

67. App. *BC*. 2.106.
68. Suet. *Iul*. 76.1.
69. These final honors served as the basis for those granted to imperial family members after their deaths and deifications—that is, a priest, a temple, and a priestly college (Price 1987, 78). The *pulvinar* is also mentioned in some of the literary sources discussing deification (such as in the case for the deification of Nero's daughter in Tac. *Ann*. 15.23). For further discussion of the *pulvinar* in the context of deification, see McIntyre 2013, 226, with bibliography.
70. Cic. *Phil*. 2.110. Koortbojian (2013, 32–39) discusses each of these four honors in turn, stressing that they do not necessarily imply that Caesar was *made* a god but instead constitute symbols of divinity and that Caesar's status could only be ratified through cult.
71. Antony was finally installed as *flamen divi Iuli* in 40 BCE (Plut. *Ant*. 33.1).
72. Koortbojian (2013, 32) argues that Cicero's attack on Antony was meant not as a declaration of Julius Caesar's divinity but rather as an attack on the man who presented himself as Caesar's most loyal supporter.
73. *ILS* 73: *diuo Iulio iussu | populi Romani | statutum est lege Rufrena* (To Divus Julius, by order of the Roman people, [this monument] has been erected in accordance with the *Lex Rufrena*). This *lex* could have been proposed by a Rufrenus who was a tribune of the plebs and who had previously served in the Caesarian forces. The exact date of his tribuneship is also debated.
74. One such example is *ILS* 72: *genio dei Iuli | parentis patriae | quem senatus | populusque | Romanus in | deorum numerum | rettulit* (To the *genius* of Divus Julius, *parens patriae*, whom the Senate and the Roman people registered into the number of the gods).
75. Plut. *Caes*. 67.4. Brutus and his followers (the other faction) were given their provinces and suitable honors in an attempt to make everyone happy.
76. Fishwick, *ICLW* 1.1, 65–66. Weinstock (1971, 388–89) seems to suggest that this meeting was part of a “trial” to determine the fate of Caesar, the second part of which occurred on 1 January 42 BCE, when Caesar was “officially” deified.
77. The main sources for Caesar's funeral are Suet. *Iul*. 84; App. *BC*. 2.143–47; Cass. Dio 44. Other information surrounding these events can be found in Plutarch's lives of Caesar, Antony, and Brutus as well as in some of Cicero's writing from the period. For a discussion of these sources and relevant bibliography, see Osgood 2006, 12–13.
78. App. *BC*. 2.147–48.
79. Suetonius's account states that while people were arguing about where to take it (either to the Capitol or to the Hall of Pompey), two beings with swords set fire to it (Suet. *Iul*. 84.3). These two beings may be linked with other apparitions, specifically of the Dioscuri, who appear at key moments to announce victory or participate in particular battles (for example, according to Cass. Dio 41.61.4, two men announce Caesar's victory over Pompey at Pharsalus). For further discussion of the connection between the Dioscuri and Caesar as well as their temple and the site of Caesar's cremation, see Sumi 2005, 110–11.
80. App. *BC*. 2.148: ἐνθα βωμὸς πρῶτος ἐτέθη, νῦν δ' ἐστὶ νεὼς αὐτοῦ Καίσαρος, θεῶν τιμῶν ἀξιουμένου (There an altar was first erected, now there is a temple of Caesar himself, having been deemed worthy of divine honors). Cass. Dio 44.51.2 also mentions the construction of an altar: βωμὸν δὲ τινα ἐν τῷ τῆς πυρᾶς χωρίῳ ἰδυσάμενοι . . . θύειν τε ἐπ' αὐτῷ καὶ κατάρχεσθαι τῷ Καίσαρι ὡς καὶ θεῷ ἐπεχείρουν (But they set up an altar on the site of the pyre . . . and undertook to

sacrifice on it and to offer victims to Caesar, as to a god).

81. Suet. *Iul.* 85: *Postea solidam columnnam prope viginti pedum lapidis Numidici in Foro statuit inscriptis parenti patriae. Apud eam longo tempore sacrificare, vota suscipere, controversias quasdam interposito per Caesarem iure iurando distrahere perseveravit.* (Afterward, they set up a solid column of Numidian marble almost twenty feet high, inscribed “to the Parent of his Country.” At which for a long time, they continued to make sacrifices, to undertake vows, to resolve some of their disputes by swearing an oath in Caesar’s name.). Koortbojian (2013, 26–27) argues that both of these accounts could be correct, as there are other cases where an altar and column are placed together (such as in the honors granted to Germanicus as outlined in the *Tabula Siarensis*).
82. Weinstock (1971, 364–67) attempts to clear up the conflicts and create a timeline of monuments. The conflicting accounts are further complicated by Cicero’s reference to a funeral monument erected by the people but destroyed by the consul Dolabella within a month (Cic. *Phil.* 1.5). For other references to the terminology and ancient sources discussing these monuments, see Weinstock 1971, 364.
83. App. *BC.* 3.2–3; Val. Max. 9.15.1.
84. Taylor 1931, 84. Mentioned also by Cicero in his letters to Atticus (Cic. *Att.* 14.6–8). For the evidence for Amatius, see Sumi 2005, 113–15.
85. Val. Max. 9.15.1.
86. App. *BC.* 3.2. Valerius Maximus 9.15.1 puts the responsibility for his death in the hands of the Fathers (*patres*).
87. App. *BC.* 3.3.
88. Sumi 2005, 111. For a discussion of the conservative nature of Antony’s actions, see Scheid 2005, 183–84.
89. For discussion on Octavian/Augustus’s political uses of the cult of Divus Julius, see Ramage 1985; Scheid 2005, 183–84; Weinstock 1971, 367–70; H. Whittaker 1996.
90. The comet is mentioned in Suet. *Iul.* 88; *Plut. Caes.* 69.3; Pliny *NH.* 2.93–94 as the symbol of Caesar’s *apotheosis*. Along with iconography, it is also mentioned in much of the poetry of the period (Virg. *Ec.* 9.46–49; Prop. 4.6.59–60). For a complete discussion of references to Caesar in Augustan poetry and the importance of the comet, see White 1988, 345–53. For a discussion of the comet itself and how the sighting of a comet became a positive omen, see Ramsey and Licht 1997, 135–53.
91. Suet. *Iul.* 88: *Creditumque est animam esse Caesaris in caelum recepti* (and was believed to be the soul of Caesar received into the heavens).
92. Plin. *NH.* 2.93–94.
93. In the case of Augustus’s funeral, an eagle that was released from the pyre was interpreted as carrying his soul to the heavens (Cass.Dio 56.42.3). For Drusilla, Livius Geminius declared an oath stating that he had seen her ascending to heaven and conversing with the other gods (Cass.Dio 59.11.4).
94. Cass.Dio 47.18.3–19.3.
95. Although the term he uses is ἱερῶν, which signifies a temple or shrine built for a hero, following his common use of ἱερός for deified individuals.
96. An honor that was later given to many members of the imperial family, not all of whom were deified (such as Marcellus). For a discussion of the use of the *pompa circensis* for the promotion of the imperial family, see Arena 2009, 77–93.
97. In his *Res Gestae* (19.1), Augustus claims that the decreed temple was built by him alone. Vitr. 3.3.2: *Ergo pycnostylos est, cuius intercolumnio unius et dimidiatae columnae crassitudo interponi potest, quemadmodum est divi Iulii et in Caesaris foro Veneris et si*

quae aliae sic sunt compositae (Thus it is pyncostyle, whose space in between two columns of one column and a half can be interposed, as is in that of Divus Julius and of Venus in the forum of Caesar, and any others that are so arranged).

98. Whereas Drusus delivered the “private” or family eulogy from the Republican Rostra (Cass.Dio 56.43.1–4; Suet. Aug. 100.3).
99. Vell. Pat. 2.126: *Sacravit parentem suum Caesar non imperio, sed religione, non appellavit eum, sed fecit deum* (Caesar [Tiberius] consecrated his father not by his *imperium* but by his devotion to the gods, he did not call him a god, but made him one).
100. For example, after his death, Marcellus was buried in Augustus’s mausoleum, and his golden image, a chair, and a golden crown were to be carried as part of the *θεῖον* (interpreted by Arena [2009, 79] as referring to the *pompa circensis*) during the *Ludi Romani* and placed among the aediles (Cass.Dio 53.30.6).
101. Zanker 1988, 221.
102. *CIL* 10.3757 = *ILS* 137; Gradel 2002, 268–69.
103. *ILS* 139. The line numbers for both inscriptions discussed in this section are taken from Lott 2012. Lott provides the text, transliteration, and facing translation of *ILS* 139 on pp. 57–65 and for *ILS* 140 on pp. 67–77. For *ILS* 140, I have included both sets of numbering from Lott (his numbers and the standard line numbering from the *CIL* as provided by Lott in brackets). An English translation can be found in Rowe 2002, 107–8, whose interpretation I generally follow, with some small additions.
104. This is a translation of the abbreviation: q.d.e.r.f.p.d.e.r.i.c (*ILS* 139, 8): [q(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret) d(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(ensuere)]. For a discussion of this expansion, see Rowe 2002, 108.
105. *ILS* 139, 16–26. Gabine dress denotes the practice of wearing a toga with arms unimpeded by folds and may reflect a style worn by Gabine priests, although both Scheid (1995, 19) and Cooley (2006, 244) note that this style came to be regarded as typically “Roman” practice. Its mention in this inscription further demonstrates the Roman (based in Rome) aspect of these practices.
106. *cippoque grandi secundum aram defixso hoc decretum cum superioribus decretis ad ei[us] honores pertinentibus incidatur in sculpturæ* (*ILS* 139, 29–31).
107. *id sequendum quod de iis senatus p(opuli) R(omani) censuisset* (*ILS* 139, 33).
108. *uti colonis Iuliensibus coloniae Opsequenti[s] Iuliae Pisanae ex hoc decreto ea om<n>ia facere exequique permittat* (*ILS* 139, 36–37).
109. *ILS* 140, 69–71 (31–33): *ut[ique] eo die quodannis publice Manibus eius per magistratus eosve, qu[i] Pi[s]is iure dicendo praeunt, eodem loco eodemque modo, quo L(ucio) C(aes)ari parentari institutum est, parentetur*.
110. For a discussion of the legality behind the decision-making process outlined in the decree, see Lott 2012, 192–93.
111. *ILS* 140, 58–68 (20–30). The funerary rites and the cult of the dead are discussed in detail in Toynbee 1971, 43–64.
112. Ov. *Fast.* 2.533–70. Lott 2012, 202–3 also notes the connection of this day with *Alliensis dies* [18 July], when the anniversary of the Gallic sack of Rome in 390 BCE is marked by the prohibition of public and private business.
113. *ILS* 140, 69–71 (31–33).
114. Ando (2000, 305) suggests that the language surrounding the decoration of the arch (specifically, *spolis devictarum aut in fidem receptarum ab eo gentium* [with the spoils of the races conquered by or surrendered unconditionally to him]) demonstrates that this decree was influenced by an official document, whereas Rowe

- (2002, 113–44) argues that the hyperbolic rhetoric of the decree suggests a more local conception of the imperial power structure.
115. For a discussion of Hellenization, honorific language, and the development of imperial arches, see Wallace-Hadrill 1990. In this inscription, the arch is either an *ianus* or *arcus* (only the *-us* survives) rather than a *for[n]ix*, which is the term for republican triumphal arches.
 116. This inscription has been reconstructed based on letter holes in the pediment as *C(aio) Caesar[us] Augusti f(ilio), co(n)s(uli), L(ucio) Caesar[us] Augusti f(ilio) co(n)s(uli) designato, principibus iuuentutis*. For a complete discussion of the temple architecture and dedicatory inscription, see Amy and Gros 1979. Anderson (2001) proposes a new interpretation, suggesting that the surviving temple was built some time during Hadrian's reign. He does suggest that this might be a similar case to Hadrian's renovation of the Pantheon in Rome but never suggests to whom this temple was dedicated. This means that this temple still could have been dedicated to Gaius and Lucius, as Amy and Gros have suggested, even though it was later rebuilt by Hadrian.
 117. *CIL* 13.3671: *[Dis Manibus] L(ucii) Caesaris Au[g(usti) f(iliu)m, auguris, co(n)s(ulis), design(ati)] / principis [inventutis et C(aui) Caesaris, Aug(usti) f(iliu)m, pontificis], co(n)s(ulis), im[p(eratoris)] / principis iuuentutis*. A similar inscription is found at Reims (*CIL* 13.3254).
 118. Lott 2012, 192.
 119. *ILS* 140, 55–57 (17–19).
 120. Ando 2000, 307.
 121. Rowe 2002, 115–16.
 122. These titles are discussed in detail in Rowe 2002, 114–18.
 123. Rowe argues that instead of using the standard titles, Gaius Caesar is referred to as “being most just and most like his father in virtues, and the sole defense of our colony” (*ILS* 140, 51–52 [13–14]: *ac simillimum parentis sui virtutibus principem coloniaeque nostrae unicum praesidium*) (Rowe 2002, 144, with translation of the text on 112). Wallace-Hadrill (1990, 166) stresses the importance of honorific language as a part of the construction of imperial power and as a way of legitimizing power relationships and these new forms of behavior.
 124. For a discussion of the position of *patronus*, see Lott 2012, 180–81. There are numerous examples of members of the imperial family and even the emperor being made patrons of communities. For example, Augustus, Agrippa, Gaius Caesar, and Tiberius were all named in inscriptions or on coins as patrons of Ulia in Spain (Curchin 1991, 89, with bibliography).
 125. *ILS* 140, 92–94 (54–56): *ab eis quicumqu[e] post[er]ea in colonia nostra (duo)vir(i) praefecti sive ali magistratus er[un]t, Omnia in perpetuum ita fieri agi haberi opservarique*.
 126. Tac. *Ann.* 1.78.
 127. Mierse 1999, 133–34. Two coins minted at Tarraco (*RPC* 1.219 and *RPC* 1.224) have been directly linked to this event and promote the construction of the temple. For a discussion of the archaeology of the temple complex and the various building stages, see Fishwick, *ICLW*. Fishwick 1999, 121–38, expands on this analysis. Carreté, Keay, and Millett (1995, 30) argue that the temple would have in fact been associated with the forum and its complement of temples, none of which survive. The temple in the upper town was a temple to Rome and Augustus (the municipal temple) and was a part of the administrative complex. This argument has been convincingly refuted by Fishwick as well as Keay (2003) and others. The dating of

the upper terrace to the Flavian period implies that the provincial temple would have taken more than fifty years to build (as is the case with the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus in Rome) (Fishwick, *ICLW* 3.1, 52). Gros (1990) discusses the importance of the connection between theaters and cult space.

128. Tac. *Ann.* 1.77.

129. See Cowan 2009a, 184, with bibliography.

130. Tac. *Ann.* 1.76–79.

131. This follows on the “petition and response” model outlined by Millar (1992) and further discussed in the context of religious practices in the empire by Bendlin (1997).

132. Tac. *Ann.* 4.37; 25 CE.

133. Tac. *Ann.* 4.15; For Tacitus’s account of Gaius Silanus’s crimes, see Tac. *Ann.* 3.66–69.

134. Price (1984b) argues that there was some negotiation before cult could be established and that officials could serve as intermediaries throughout this process. However, in most cases, we see only the final result.

135. Fishwick, *ICLW* 1.1, 158. This decision again reflects the “petition and response” model presented by Millar (1977). Here, Tiberius is not necessarily making policy (since he has allowed a similar type of cult to exist in Asia), and his rejection of a cult to himself and his mother does not prevent communities from setting up priests and cults to Tiberius and his mother at the civic level, as will be discussed subsequently.

136. Pelling 2010, 367–68.

137. Tac. *Ann.* 4.34–36.

138. Tac. *Ann.* 4.37–38. For a thorough discussion of the use of language and precedent throughout this speech, see Cowan 2009a, with bibliography; Pelling 2010.

139. In 30 BCE, Octavian rejected any attempt to worship him as a god (Cass.Dio 51.19–20), and this action provided a general pattern for how later emperors would react to the request to set up cult while the emperors were still living, although Gradel (2002) argues convincingly that these distinctions between worship in Rome and Italy and in the provinces are not as clear as Cassius Dio would suggest. For a discussion of contemporary writers’ expectations about Tiberius’s succession, Augustan precedents, and how closely Tiberius’s peers expected him to “be Augustus,” see Cowan 2009b. Hekster (2015, 1) argues that the emperorship was an ideological construct and therefore that the construction of his power was a careful negotiation of expectations and traditions through different types of media.

140. Tac. *Ann.* 4.37.

141. Tac. *Ann.* 4.37. *ita omnes per provincias effigie numinum sacrari ambitiosum, superbum; et vanescet Augusti honor, si promiscis adulationibus vulgatur* (To be consecrated through all the provinces in the likeness of divinities would be aggrandizing and insolent; and the honor of Augustus will vanish if it is vulgarized by indiscriminate flattery).

142. Cowan 2009a, 200.

143. Cowan 2009b, 483.

144. *CIL* 2.194: *Q(uinto) Iulio Q(uinti) f(ilio) G(aleria) Ploto, aed(ili), iivir(o), flamini Germ(anici) Caesaris, flamini Iuliae Aug(ustae) inperpetum* (To Quintus Julius Plotus, son of Quintus, of the tribe Galeria, aedile, *duovir*, *flamen* of Germanicus Caesar, *flamen* of Julia Augusta forever).

145. AE 1915, 95: *Cn(aeo) Cornelio C(aii) f(ilio) Pap(iria) Severo, aed(ili) iivir(o), fl(ami)ni Iul(ia)e Aug(ustae), praefecto fabr(um), amici (e)x pago aug(usto)* (To Gnaeus Cornelius Severus, son of Gaius, of the tribe Papiria, aedile, *duovir, flamen* of Julia Augusta, *praefectus* of the craftsmen. The *amici* from the Augustan district [set this up]).
146. CIL 2.49: *M(arco) Aurelio C(aii) f(ilio), Gal(eria), iivir(o), fl(ami)ni Ti(berii) Caesaris Aug(usti), praefec(to) fabr(um), d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* (To Marcus Aurelius, son of Gaius, of the tribe Galeria, *duovir, flamen* of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, *praefectus* of the craftsmen, by decree of the decurions).
147. The practice of emperor worship was a means by which the community could display its loyalty to Rome and to the ruling dynasty (Mackie 1983, 121).
148. Tac. *Ann.* 4.37–38.
149. Hopkins (1978, 209) has argued that in the West, emperors themselves or their delegates played an important role in initiating and organizing the cult of the emperor, yet this is clearly not always the case.
150. Grether 1946, 224. For the most recent discussion of imperial cult practices in the East (and specifically in Greece), see Camia 2011. The most recent discussion of Hellenistic ruler cult can be found in Günther and Plischke 2011.
151. Cass.Dio 51.20.6–8; Gradel 2002, 73–77. For a discussion of the worship of the living emperor and this passage, see also Madsen 2009.
152. This section examines those who were not officially deified in Rome (given the title *divus* or *diva*) but who were granted exceptional honors in the provinces. Taking into consideration the discussion on making a god in chap. 1, these individuals arguably were made into gods in the provinces (through the granting of priesthoods) even though they were not necessarily officially made gods within the city of Rome.
153. Boatwright 1987, 251. For ancient accounts of the drowning, see Cass.Dio 69.11.2–4; SHA. *Had.* 14.5–7.
154. For a discussion of the Egyptian tradition and his cult, see Birley 1997, 247–56; Everitt 2009, 287–94.
155. There is no evidence of similar festivals to those in the East being celebrated in the West (Boatwright 1987, 253).
156. CIL 13.2114.
157. CIL 13.1036 = AE 1980, 626 (Saintes, Charente-Maritime, France; 19 CE):
Germanico [Caesa]r[i] Ti(beri) Aug(usti) f(ilio) | divi Augusti nep(oti) divi Iuli pronep(oti) auguri | flam(ini) August(ali) co(n)s(uli) II imp(eratori) II | Ti(berio) Caesar[i] divi Aug(usti) f(ilio) divi Iuli nep(oti) Aug(usto)] | pontif(ici) max(s)imo sic [co(n)s(uli) III] imp(eratori) VIII [tri]b(unicia) pot(estate) [XXI] | Dr[us]o Caesari [Ti(beri) Aug(usti)] f(ilio) | [divi Augusti] nep(oti) divi Iuli | [pronep(oti) co(n)s(uli)] pontifici auguri
C(aius) Iulius C(ai) Iuli Catuaneuni f(ilius) Rufus [C(ai) Iul(i) Agedomopatidis nepos Epotsorovidi pronep(os) Volt(inia)] | sacerdos Romae et Augusti ad aram [quae est ad Confluentem] praefectus fabrum d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecit)]
158. For a discussion of honorific arches, see chap. 1.
159. For a discussion of this arch and the importance of kinship, see Hekster 2015, 164–65.
160. Tac. *Ann.* 1.54. Tiberius and Drusus were also members of this group.
161. CIL 12.3180 (unknown date).
162. CIL 12.3207 (unknown date).

163. *CIL* 12.1872 (unknown date). He was also a military tribune, *Illvir*, and *praefectus* of the craftsmen (*fabrum*).
164. These honors are discussed in detail in Corbier 1994; Frascchetti 1989; González and Arce 1998; Lott 2012; Rowe 2002. The following discussion is by no means exhaustive of all of the honors granted to Germanicus. The *Tabula Hebana* and *Tabula Siarensis* have been collected with images, transcriptions, translations, and commentary in Lott 2012. The line numbers referred to in this book for both the *Tabula Hebana* and the *Tabula Siarensis* come from Lott 2012 and include the standard line numbers in brackets.
165. Gonzalez 1999, 124; Lott 2012, 210. However, Tacitus mentions only a few of the honors rather than the twenty-seven honors recorded in the *Tabula Siarensis* and the *Tabula Hebana*. For a complete discussion of the possible motives for Tacitus's account and why he chose to include certain honors while neglecting others, see Gonzalez 1999.
166. Lott (2012, 210) suggests that the erection of these inscriptions within these communities demonstrated loyalty to the imperial house rather than promoted the actions undertaken within the community itself.
167. *Tab. Siar.* 170–76. A similar stipulation is made at the end of the *SCPP*.
168. *Tab. Siar.* 101 (4).
169. *Tab. Siar.* 103–5 (6–8).
170. Tac. *Ann.* 2.83. Germanicus was the *flamen divi Augusti*, and this office could only be held by a member of the family. His brother, Drusus, became *flamen divi Augusti* in his place. This stipulation also includes augurs, suggesting that many of the positions within the main priesthoods of Rome were occupied by members of the imperial family.
171. *Tab. Heb.* 208–9 (6–7).
172. Tac. *Ann.* 2.83; *Tab. Heb.* 205–6 (4–5).
173. *Tab. Siar.* 136–40 (1–5 of frag. (b) col. 1).
174. *Tab. Siar.* 141–43 (6–8 of frag. (b) col. 1).
175. The curule chair is mentioned in *Tab. Heb.* 252 (51) and in Tac. *Ann.* 2.83. (Tacitus records the group as being the *sacerdotes Augustales*.) The *Tabula Hebana* also stipulates that the chair itself was to be stored in the temple of Divus Augustus once it had been completed (and until that time, in the temple of Mars Ultor).
176. Cass. Dio 53.30.5–6.
177. Arena (2009) suggests that even though there is no surviving evidence, it is likely that Gaius and Lucius also received this honor.
178. *Tab. Siar.* 106–18 (9–21).
179. Severy 2000, 325. *Tab. Siar.* 115–18 (18–21) states that the statues placed on the top of the arch included Germanicus, Drusus (his father and brother of Tiberius), Antonia (his mother), Agrippina (his wife), Livia (his sister), Tiberius Germanicus (his brother, Claudius), and his sons and daughters.
180. Kleiner 1989; Wallace-Hadrill 1990.
181. McIntyre forthcoming. For a discussion of Germanicus and the representations of his family, see McWilliam 2010.
182. Kleiner 1989, 200.
183. *Tab. Siar.* 123–31 (26–34). Frenz (1989) argues that the foundation of a triumphal arch found at Mainz-Kastel is the arch to Germanicus *apud ripam Rheni*.
184. *Tab. Siar.* 119–23 (22–26); *Tab. Siar.* 132–35 (35–38).

185. 24 May. *Feriale Duranum*, no.117, col. ii, lines 12–13: *viii kal(endas) iunias ob natalem gl[er]mani[c] <i> cae[sa]ris sup[pli]cat[i]o [me]mori[ae ge]rm[anici] | c[a]esaris*. (Nine days before the Kalends of June [24 May]: For the birthday of Germanicus Caesar, a *supplicatio* to the memory of Germanicus Caesar.) For a discussion of the rite of *supplicatio* and its transformation from a ritual of religious thanksgiving into a personal honor, see Wallace-Hadrill 1990, 160.
186. McIntyre forthcoming.
187. Tac. *Ann.* 4.9: *Memoriae Drusi eadem quae in Germanicum decernuntur, plerisque additis, ut ferme amat posterior adulatio*. (The memorials of Drusus were the same as those which were decreed to Germanicus, with numerous additions, as later flattery commonly loves to do.)
188. Tac. *Ann.* 2.73.1: *Funus sine imaginibus et pompa per laudes ac memoriam virtutum eius celebre fuit* (His funeral, without images or a procession, was distinguished through eulogies and the memory of his virtues).
189. Rose (1997, 28) argues that after Drusus's death, the focus of honors shifted to retrospective commemoration, highlighted in this list of ancestors.
190. *CIL* 6.31200; *Tabula Ilicitana*; Lott 2012, 159–73; Rowe 2002, 38–40.
191. Lebek 1989. For a discussion of the reconstruction of the fragments, see Lott 2012, 311–17.
192. Although Bendlin (1997, 51) argues that Roman epigraphic habits and religious practices were disseminated through *colonia*, *municipia*, and the army, in many cases there is no clear central involvement in the establishment of cult.
193. Tac. *Ann.* 4.37.1.
194. *CIL* 2.194 (14–29 CE): *Q(uinto) Iulio Q(uinti) f(ilio) G(aleria) Ploto, aed(ili), iivir(o), fl(amin)i Germ(anici) Caesaris, fl(amin)i Iuliae Aug(ustae) inperpetum*. (To Quintus Iulius Plotus, son of Quintus, of the tribe Galeria, aedile, *duovir*, *flamen* of Germanicus Caesar, *flamen* of Julia Augusta forever.)
195. *AE* 1915, 95 (14–29 CE): *Cn(aeo) Cornelio C(aii) f(ilio) Pap(iria) Severo, aed(ili) iivir(o), fl(amin)i Iuliae Augustae, praefecto fabr(um), amici (e)x pago aug(usto)*. (To Gnaeus Cornelius Severus, son of Gaius, of the tribe Papiria, aedile, *duovir*, *flamen* of Julia Augusta, *praefectus* of the craftsmen. The *amici* from the Augustan district [set this up].)
196. These variations and titles are discussed in more detail in chaps. 3 and 4.
197. Many of these coins specifically alluded to the imperial cult (Burnett et al., 1992, 69).
198. *RPC* 1.39, dated to the reign of Tiberius.
199. *CIL* 2.49 (14–37 CE): *M(arco) Aurelio C(aii) f(ilio), Gal(eria), iivir(o), fl(amin)i Ti(berii) Caesaris Aug(usti), praefec(to) fabr(um), d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*. (To Marcus Aurelius, son of Gaius, of the tribe Galeria, *duovir*, *flamen* of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, *praefectus* of the craftsmen, by decree of the decurions.)
200. Suet. *Cl.* 2.1; Strabo 4.3.2; Cass.Dio 54.32.1.
201. Hopkins 1978, 209.
202. Mackie 1983, 121.
203. As discussed in chap. 1 with the case of the request to Tiberius for cult.
204. Tullia Avia was a *flaminica Iuliae Augustae* from Baeterrae (*CIL* 12.4249; unknown date). Caninia Tertia was a *flaminica Aug(ustae) perpetua*, which suggests that she was responsible for overseeing the worship of the living empress, although since this inscription cannot be dated with any certainty beyond the general range of 1st–2nd

centuries CE, it is unclear for whose cult she was responsible (AE 1951, 81; Thuburnia ad Aquas). The title *flaminica augustae* is quite common. Some examples include Julia Helias (CIL 13.2181, Lugdunum, unknown date) and an *Ignota* (CIL 12.4229, Baeterrae, unknown date). Unfortunately, most of these inscriptions include only the name of the individual and the priestly title (if at all) and provide almost no other information.

205. CIL 12.1363 (14–51 CE). For a brief commentary on this inscription, see Spickermann 1994, 211.
206. Most of the modern scholarship on these groups has concerned their nature, organization, and purpose and how they changed over time. The three works on which all current studies are based are Duthoy 1976; Taylor 1914; von Premerstein 1893. For the most recent discussion of the overall organization of the *Augustales*, see Abramenko 1993a, 13–37.
207. See Garnsey and Saller 1987, 121; Nock 1972, 354. Garnsey and Saller argue that these groups served the dual purpose of recognizing the superiority of the wealthy freedmen over the masses and reflecting the most basic criterion for status, birth. Gordon (1990a) uses the term *symbolic capital* to discuss the ways in which individuals could gain prestige within their communities by nonpolitical means (that is, without holding political office).
208. CIL 13.2181 (unknown date): *D(is) M(anibus), Iuliae Heliadis, Sex(ti) Iuli Callisti et Iuliae Nices filiae, flaminic(ae) aug(ustae) quae vixit annis xxv, mensibus ii. Iuliae Heliane et Callistate corpus sororis anima sua sibi carioris ab urbe adferri curaverunt et sarcophago intra maesolaeum condiderunt.* (To the divine shades of Julia Helias, daughter of Sextus Julius Callistus and Julia Nices, *flaminica* of Augusta, who lived 25 years, and 2 months. Julia Heliane and Julia Callistate took care to have brought the body of their sister, who was more dear to them than their own souls, from the city and interred her in a sarcophagus in the mausoleum.)
209. Purcell (1986, 85) argues that the female members of the imperial family presented a new position for women within the *res publica* and allowed priestesses in provincial communities to take on some of that role within their own communities.
210. Vell. Pat. 2.130.5; Wood 1999, 83.
211. SCPP 432–35 (115–18). Line numbers are taken from Lott 2012 with the conventional numbering in parentheses. For images, texts, transliterations, and translation, see Lott 2012, 125–57. For a discussion of the senatorial decree and the promotion of the imperial family, see Rowe 2002.
212. Tac. Ann. 2.43, 2.82, 3.15, 3.17; SCPP 426–37 (109–20).
213. ILGN 638 (before 37 CE); Spickermann 1994, 207.
214. ILGN 635 = AE 1980, 615.
215. At least according to the ancient sources: Cass.Dio 58.11.6–7; 65.14.1–2; Jos. AJ. 18.181–82.
216. AE 1997, 397 (50–59 CE).
217. Tac. Ann. 12.27.1–2; Germ. 28. It then became Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium. For a discussion of her connection with this community and the ways in which it strove to connect itself to the imperial house through buildings and dedications, see Haensch 1999, 641–55.
218. Tac. Ann. 13.2.
219. For a discussion of the worship of emperors during their lifetimes in Italy, see Gradel 2002, 85–91.
220. Cass.Dio 51.20.6–8. For a discussion of senators and the worship of the imperial

family, see Várhelyi 2010, 112–15, 130–32. There are examples of priesthoods being dedicated to Rome and Augustus in the earliest development of cult practices in Narbonensis; see Christol 1999.

221. Várhelyi (2010, 130) warns against taking all religious significance out of statue dedications.

222. *Augusti sacerdos*: CIL 10.840, 943–44; *sacerdos divi Augusti*: CIL 10. 945–46.

223. Fishwick (1978, 1214) suggests that the difference in the titles *flamen* and *sacerdos* reflects two different types or emperor worship: the cult of Roma and the living ruler occurred in the less “Romanized” provinces (Fishwick uses the example of Tres Galliae), was focused on an altar, and was the responsibility of a *sacerdos*. In more “Romanized” provinces (Fishwick refers to Spain), the cult of Divus Augustus was served by a *flamen* at a temple.

224. Gradel 2002, 86–91.

225. AE 1951, 205 = IRT 319.

[Imp(erator) Caesar divi f(ilius) Augustus] co(n)s(ul) XI imp(erator) XIII
trib(unicia) pot(estate) XV pont(ifex) m[axi]mus

M(arco) Licinio M(arci) f(ilio) Crasso Frugi co(n)s(ule) augure
proco(n)s(ule) patrono flaminib(us) August(i) Caesaris Iddib[a]le Arinis
f(ilio) [- - -]one [et· ? · A]nnobalis [f(ilio) - - -]on[- - -] [su]feti(b)us
M[uttun] Annonis f(ilio) · ? ·]

Annobal «Himilcho» f(ilius) Tapapius Rufus sufes flamen praefectus
sacrorum de sua pequ[nia faciun[dum] coe]rauit idem[que] de[d]icauit

(Imperator Caesar Augustus, son of Divus [Iulius], consul for the eleventh time, imperator for the fourteenth time, holding tribunician power for the fifteenth time, *pontifex maximus*.)

When Marcus Licinius Crassus Frugi, son of Marcus, consul, augur, was proconsul and patron and when the *flamines* of Augustus Caesar were Iddibal, son of Arin and [. . . ? . . .] son of Annobal [. . . ? . . .] and when the *sufetes* were Muttur son of Annon [. . . ? . . .]

Annobal Himilcho Rufus, son of Tapapius, *sufes*, *flamen*, *praefectus* of sacred things, saw to the making [of this] with his own money and likewise dedicated it.)

The reconstruction of this text and its expansion comes from IRT. For the Neo-Punic text and a discussion of this bilingual inscription, see Wilson 2012, 274–78.

226. The Neo-Punic text gives the name of the second priest as Abdelmeqart.

227. Wilson (2012, 278) also notes that although Annobal Tapapius Rufus is a Punic name, it is presented in the Latin *tria nomina* format.

228. Marcus Licinius Crassus Frugi had been consul in Rome in 14 BCE and, according to the inscription, was also an augur.

229. CIL 12.4230: L(ucio) Aponio . . . | praefecto equit(um), tribune militum [leg(ionis)] vii | et leg(ionis) xxii, praefecto(o) castrorum, flaminibus Aug(usti) | primo Urbi Iul(iae) Baeter(ri)s, praefecto pro iiviro C(ai) Caesaris Augusti f(ilii). (To Lucius Aponius [. . . ? . . .], *praefectus* of the *equites*, military tribune of the Seventh and Twenty-Second Legions, *praefectus* of the camps, first *flamen* of Augustus in the city of Iulia Baeterrae, *praefectus* for the *duoviri* of Gaius Caesar, son of Augustus.)

230. Christol 1999, 15. Christol also discusses the particular aspects of his career in

more detail.

231. *CIL* 12.4426:

[P(ublico)] Usuleno Veiento[nis f(ilio)---] | iiviro, q(uaestori), flamini primum [--- | Plocamus l(ib)ertus] posuit. (To Publicus Usulenius, son of Veiento, *duovir*, quaestor, *flamen primum*. The freedman Plocamus set [this] up.)

Christol (1999, 19) dates both this inscription and the one from Baeterrae to the last decade of the 1st century BCE.

232. Such as in the case of a provincial priest from Narbonensis (*ILGN* 634) and a priestess from Mauretania (*AE* 1916, 91).

233. *CIL* 2.2038 (Anticaria, Baetica; 14–29 CE): *Iuliae Aug(ustae) Drusi [fil(iae)] div(i) Aug(usti) uxori, matri Tiberi Caesaris Aug(usti) principis et conservatoris, et Drusi Germanici, gen[etrici] orbis. M(arcus) Cornelius Proculus, pontufex caesarum.* (To Julia Augusta, daughter of Drusus, wife of Divus Augustus, mother of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, *princeps* and savior, and of Drusus Germanicus, mother of the world. Marcus Cornelius Proculus, *pontufex caesarum* [dedicated this].)

CIL 2.2039 (Anticaria, Baetica; 18–19 CE): *German(ico) C[ae]s[ar]i, Ti(beri) Aug(usti) f(ilio), div(i) Aug(usti) n(epoti), d[ivi] Iuli pro[n]n(epoti), co(n)s(uli) ii, imperatori [ii, auguri, fl]a[mi]n[i] Aug(usti), M(arcus) Cornelius Proculus, pontufex caesarum.* (To Germanicus Caesar, son of Tiberius Augustus, grandson of Divus Augustus, great-grandson of Divus Julius, consul for the second time, imperator for the second time, augur, *flamen* of Augustus. Marcus Cornelius Proculus, *pontufex caesarum* [dedicated this].)

234. Étienne 1958, 231–32. Fishwick, *ICLW* 1.2, 233, argues that *caesares* in this case denotes the ruling dynasty as a whole.

235. For example, when completing a series of building programs in Rome in the first decade CE, Tiberius dedicated the renovated temple of Castor and Pollux and the temple of Concordia in his brother's name (Cass.Dio 55.27, 56.25).

236. *CIL* 2.2040 (Anticaria, Baetica; 23 CE): *Dr[uso] Caesari Ti(beri) Aug(usti)[f] f(ilio), divi Aug(usti) n(epoti), divi Iuli pron(epoti), tribunica potestate i[i], co(n)s(uli) ii, pontufex. Cornelius Bassus, pontufex caesarum d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(ono) d(edit).* (To Drusus Caesar, son of Tiberius Augustus, grandson of Divus Augustus, great-grandson of Divus Julius, holding tribunician power for the second time, consul for the second time, *pontufex*. Cornelius Bassus, *pontufex caesarum*, gave this as a gift with his own money.)

237. *IRT* 596 (Lepcis Magna; before 37 CE): *M(arcus) Fulvius Saturninus, flamen Ti(beri) Caesaris Aug(usti) d(ono) d(edit).*

238. Rives 1995, 58.

239. Rives 2001b, 431–32; *CIL* 8.26518. Another inscription (*ILAfr* 558) demonstrates that this shrine was later supplemented by an altar (*ara Augusti*).

240. Another dedication to Tiberius comes from the community of Avitina by an individual who held a local priesthood (*flamen coloniae*) but was not specifically linked to the worship of Tiberius as an individual. The individual nevertheless set up this dedication to Tiberius in 33 CE (*CIL* 8.25844). This inscription is briefly discussed in Rives 2001b, 425.

241. Price (1984b, 57) discusses the worship of living members of the imperial family within the context of the Hellenistic tradition, and although this goes beyond the

scope of this project, many of his observations demonstrate the similarities between how cults develop in the Greek and Roman worlds. In both cases, the establishment of cult during the reign of Augustus and Tiberius involved creating priesthoods to a number of living members of the imperial family. Price says that some eleven individuals received priesthoods during this period.

242. For a summary and discussion of some of the republican sources and the nature of priests (how they were appointed, changing legislation, types, and the politics of being a priest), see Beard 1990; Beard, North, and Price 1998, 1:135–40. For an excellent summary of the duties of the different priesthoods in Rome during the Republic and how they changed prior to the death of Caesar, see Szemler 1972.
243. The *flamen Dialis* has also been interpreted to be the model for the priests of the imperial family in Rome (Weinstock 1971, 306). However, as discussed in chap. 1, Cassius Dio describes Antony as the priest of Jupiter Julius, like some *flamen Dialis* (Cass. Dio 44.6.4). This does not necessarily suggest that this priesthood was modeled on the position of *flamen Dialis* in Rome but rather that Cassius Dio is making the connection between Jupiter (and his priest, the *flamen Dialis*) and Caesar in this new form with his own priest. For a discussion tracing the use of the *flamen Dialis* as model for provincial cult in modern scholarship, see Fishwick 1978, 1207.
244. Williamson 1987, 174. This article also contains the Latin text, an English translation, and commentary. It corrects the Latin text found in *CIL* 12.6038 (which was originally based on a photograph of the bronze tablet and not the tablet itself) and some earlier reconstructions (see pp. 173–78 for a thorough discussion of the scholarship associated with this inscription and bibliography). For the most recent discussion and bibliography, see Fishwick, *ICLW* 3.2, 3–15.
245. Attempts to reconstruct the inscription have relied heavily on a number of literary sources that refer not to the provincial *flamines* but to the republican priesthood of the *flamen Dialis* based in Rome (Aul. Gel. NA. 10.15; Festus 92 L; Livy 31.50.7; Plut. QR. 275 C–D).
246. Hemelrijk 2006a, 181. She extends this argument further in Hemelrijk 2005, 146–47, but never expands it to discuss the problems of associating the imperial *flamines* responsible for the worship of the imperial family with the republican *flamen Dialis*.
247. For the importance of this inscription with respect to religion and the organization of the community, see Rüpke 2006a, b. Ando's (2007) discussion focuses more on understanding priesthoods within the context of the provinces as a whole. For the text of the inscription, see RS 393–454. However, Raggi (2011, 343) argues that the municipal laws actually provide very little information about Roman religion since they discuss only the administration and financial requirements of religious matters such as ceremonies, festivals, and buildings.
248. Chaps. 64–72 are concerned with regulations on the definition and financing of cults, the priests (*pontifices* and *augures*), payments for ritual ingredients, the organization and financing of games, and the administration of money given to temples (Rüpke 2006b, 22).
249. *quos et quot dies festos esse et quae sacrafieri publice placeat et quos ea sacra facere placeat*.
250. Scheid 1999, 390. For the interaction between priests and magistrates, see Jarrett 1971; Scheid 1984.
251. Ando 2007, 436. For a discussion of how this occurred in general practice, see Gordon 1990b. According to Rüpke (2006a, 38), festivals, time and space, the choice of gods, priesthoods, and rituals could be the parameters for defining the “Romanness” of the colony.

252. *CIL* 5.5126 (Bergomum, 117 CE).
253. *CIL* 12.3212 (late 2nd century CE).
254. One such example is a priest who is *sacerdos templi divi Marci* from the community of Gorsium, Pannonia Inferior, 211 CE, *CIL* 3.3345.
255. Nicols 2006, 36.
256. Provincial priests use both *flamen* and *sacerdos*. In provinces where *sacerdos* is used for the provincial title, *flamen* is used as the civic title, and vice versa. Gordon (1990c, 201) states that titles tell something about the history of the community in which they are found as well as the connection between the *princeps* and the people of the empire, who forged these connections to secure their social and political status. In the provinces of the Spains, *pontifex* (*pontufex*) was used in the earliest stage of the development of imperial cult practices (see chap. 2).
257. Hemelrijk 2006a, 182.
258. This theory is based on the distinction between *flamen* and *sacerdos* during the republic in Rome (a *flamen* served official state cult, whereas a *sacerdos* served cults of non-Roman origin). See Beard 1990, 43–47; Beard, North, and Price 1998, 1:356; Fishwick 1978, 1207.
259. *CIL* 2.5120 (Carmo, Baetica, 14–37 CE); *CIL* 2.2105 = *CIL* II² 7, 68 (Urgavo, Baetica, 14–37 CE).
260. *AE* 1983, 519 = 1982, 520 (late 2nd century CE).
261. A shift also occurs in the titles of priests associated with the provincial cult in Africa Proconsularis. The earliest provincial priests have the title *flamen Augusti provinciae*, which then becomes *sacerdos provinciae* sometime during the reign of Trajan (possibly because of the prestige associated with the title of *sacerdos* in the province; see Fishwick, *ICLW* 3.2, 188–89; Fishwick 1984b, 337–44). A final change occurs under Marcus Aurelius, when the title becomes *sacerdotalis*, which reflects a shift in all titles associated with a number of offices, both political and religious (e.g., *iiviralis* and *flaminalis*; see Duncan-Jones 1968, 153).
262. The priests responsible for overseeing the provincial cult usually have the title *sacerdos Romae et Augusti ad aram quae est ad confluentes araris et rhodani* (or *ad confluentem*, *ad aram apud templum*, or other minor variation). For a discussion of the provincial priests from Tres Galliae, see Fishwick, *ICLW* 3.2, 17–71.
263. *Flamen coloniae augustae Nemausis*: *CIL* 12.3212. 3213; *flamen in colonia equestre vikanis Genavensibus*: *CIL* 12.2606, 2607.
264. *CIL* 12.2675.
265. *CIL* 12.140. This inscription refers to Marcus Floreius as *flaminicus* and to his wife, Uinia Fusca, as *flaminica*, which might account for the variation.
266. *CIL* 12.3180 (Nemausus; unknown date); *CIL* 12.1872 (Vienna; unknown date).
267. A *pontifex Caesarum primus*, *CIL* 2.3350 (Alcala; 14–37 CE).
268. Lucius Julius Maelus, *flamen divi Augusti* (Ager Olis; 14–37 CE; *CIL* 2.260); . . . M.f Servius Modestus, *flamen divi Augusti* (Augusta Emerita; unknown date; Curchin 1990, 172).
269. Lucius Lucretius, *pontifex perpetuus domus Augustae* (Tucci; 198–217 CE; *CIL* 2.1663 = *CIL* II² 5, 69); Lucius Calpurnius Silvinus (Urgavo; 2nd century CE?; *CIL* 2.2105).
270. Marcus Fabius Probus, *pontifex perpetuus divorum et Augustorum* (Aurgi; unknown date; *CIL* 2.3362 = *CIL* II² 5, 29).
271. Sextus Allius Mamercus, *pontifex perpetuus coloniae Astigitanae* (Astigi; late 2nd–

- early 3rd century CE; *CIL* 2.1475 = *CIL* II² 5, 1171).
272. Lucius Servilius Polio, *pontifex divi Augusti* (Carmo; 14–37 CE; *CIL* 2.5120); M . . . vius Novatus, *pontifex divi Augusti* (Urgavo; 14–37 CE; *CIL* 2.2105 = *CIL* II² 7, 68).
273. For a discussion of the town in early Roman Baetica, see Keay 1998.
274. Marcus Cassius Caecilianus, *flamen perpetuus divi Traiani* (Italica; late 2nd century CE; *AE* 1983, 519 = 1982, 520); Publius Aelius Fabianus Pater, *flamen divi Augusti* (Ulia; 14–37 CE; *CIL* 2.1534). Lucius Servilius Polio, *pontifex divi Augusti* (Carmo; 14–37 CE; *CIL* 2.5120); M . . . vius Novatus, *pontifex divi Augusti* (Urgavo; 14–37 CE; *CIL* 2.2105 = *CIL* II² 7, 68).
275. Another way of connecting one's community to the ruling dynasty is found in the *Lex Irnitana*. For text and commentary, see Gonzalez and Crawford 1986. Chap. 24 describes what happens if a community confers the duumvirate on the Emperor Caesar Domitian. This is a form of flattery that would reflect very highly on this community. Chap. 31 states that days should be set aside for the proper veneration of the imperial house (*propter venerationem domus Augustae*). For a discussion of these regulations and the importance of the ritual practices associated with the worship of the imperial family as an imperial religion (i.e., as a religion of empire), see Ando 2003, 323–26.
276. Rives 2001b, 430–31. He states that Juba may have been familiar with the cult of Divus Julius in Rome and that this may have influenced his decision to revive the tradition of honoring dead rulers. However, he also suggests that it may have been influenced by Hellenistic ruler cult tradition. For a discussion of the imperial cult and coinage under Juba, see Fishwick 1985. For a discussion of traditional African funeral cult, see Bénabou 1976, 281–85.
277. For a table of monumental Latin inscriptions per one thousand square kilometers organized by province, see Harris 1989, 268.
278. It is also difficult to determine whether an individual is a municipal *flamen* or a provincial *flamen* during the earliest stages of the development since both levels of priesthood use *flamen*. For a discussion of the shift from *flamen* to *sacerdos* (to *sacerdotalis*) in the provincial cult, see Fishwick 1984.
279. *AE* 1928, 34 (unknown date). Gaius Sextilius Maximus, a *flamen p(er)p(etuus) Neptuni*, makes a dedication to Mercury Silvanus Augustus.
280. For a list of the priests of deified individuals, including name, title, location, date, and reference, see appendix 1.
281. Tac. *Ann.* 1.78; Fishwick, *ICLW* 1.1, 155. In the Spains, the various types of provincial organizations seem to have been organized by the people themselves rather than imposed from Rome (Mackie 1983, 137).
282. *CIL* II² 14, 1139 (= *CIL* 2.4217): [---]rio | Q(uinti) [fil(io) Gal(eria)?] Fus[c]o(?) | iivir(o) flam(ini) divi | Claudi praef(ecto) orae | marit(imae) | flamine divorum et | Augustor(um) p(rovinciae) H(ispaniae) c(iterioris) provinc(ia) | Hispania citerior | [or]do Tarraconens(ium) | honores decrevit. (To . . . rio Fusco, son of Quintus, of the voting tribe Galeria. *duovir*, *flamen* of Divus Claudius, *praefectus* in charge of the control and defense of a sector of the sea coast, *flamen* of the *divi* and *Augusti* of the province of Hispania Citerior [Tarraconensis], The *ordo* of Tarraconensis decrees these honors.)
283. *CIL* 2.6095: L(ucio) Fonteio M(arci) | fil(io) Gal(eria) | Materno | Novatiano | Aedilic(i) | Hono | rib(us) ab ordine dato | ii vir | iudic(i) dec(uriarum) iii | flam(ini) divi Vespasiani | equo publico donato | ab imp(eratore) Nerva Aug(usto) | flam(ini) p(rovinciae) H(ispaniae) c(iterioris) | ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum). (To Lucius Fonteius Maternus Novatianus, son of Marcus, of the voting tribe Galeria. aedile, given these

honors by the *ordo*, *duovir*, *iudex decuriarum trium*, *flamen* of Divus Vespasian, having been given a public horse by the emperor Nerva Augustus, *flamen* of the province of Hispania Citerior, by decree of the *decuriones*.)

284. *CIL* II² 14, 1217 (= *CIL* 2.4279).

285. *CIL* II² 14, 1139 (= *CIL* 2.4217) (see note 41 above).

286. *CIL* 2.6095 (see note 42 above).

287. *CIL* II² 14, 1132 (= *CIL* 2.4212): *C(aio) Egnatule[o] | C(ai) fil(io) Gal(eria) | Senecae Tarr . . . | aed(ili) q(uaestori) iivir(o) fl(amini) divi Tit[i] equo pub(ublico) | donato praef(ecto) | coh(orti) iiii thrac(um) eq(uitata) | flamini p(rovinciae) H(ispaniae) c(iterioris) | Egnatuleia sige | patrono indul| gentissimo* (To Gaius Egnatuleus Seneca Tarr . . . , son of Gaius, of the voting tribe Galeria. aedile, quaestor, *duovir*, *flamen* of Divus Titus, having been given a public horse, *praefectus* of the Mounted fourth *cohors Thracum*, *flamen* of the province of Hispania Citerior. Egnatuleia Sige [gave this] for her most kind patron).

288. *CIL* 2.4274 (also *CIL* 2.6072): *L(ucio) Minicio | L(uci) fil(io) Gal(eria) | Aproniano | aedili q(uaestori) ii vir(o) | et q(uin)q(uennali) col(oniae) I(uliae) u(rbis) T(riumphalis) T(arraconis) flam(ini) Divi | Traian[is] p(ar)thic(i) | heredes | ex testamento*. (To Lucius Minicius Apronianus, son of Lucius, of the voting tribe Galeria, aedile, quaestor, *duovir*, and *quinquennalis* of the colony Tarraco [Julia urbs Triumphalis Tarraco], *flamen* of Divus Trajan Parthicus. His heirs [gave this] from his will.)

289. *Equo publico donato ab imperatore Nerva Augusto* (*CIL* 2.6095). The priest of Divus Titus was also given a public horse, but the inscription does not identify who gave it to him (*CIL* 2.4212 [= *CIL* II² 14, 1132]).

290. Curchin (1990, 44) suggests that the flamine was held only after the individual had held the duovirate.

291. For a discussion of the provincial *cursus honorum*, see Curchin 1990, 21–45 (esp. 43–45 on the religious offices).

292. Although many *divi* also got priests soon after their deification. Quintus Voltedius Optatus Aurelianus was a *flamen divi Nervae* who also had imperial connections, as his inscription broadcasts the fact that he was granted a public horse (*equus publicus adlectus*) by Divus Trajan (*AE* 1910, 78).

293. *CIL* 8.7986 = *ILS* 6862: *C(aius) Caecilius Q(uinti) f(ilius) Gal(eria) Gallus hab(ens) | equum pub(licum), aed(ilis) hab(ens) iur(is) dic(tionem) q(uaestoris) pro | praet(ore), praef(ectus) pro iivir(o) iiii, praef(ectus) fabr(um) co(n)s(ularis) | ii et praet(orius) ii, hab(ens) orn(amenta) quinq(uennalicia) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum), ex v decuriis dec(uriarum) iii, quinquennalis, praef(ectus) i(ure) d(icundo) Rusicadi, | flam(en) divi Iuli, | nomine suo et Proxinae M(arci) f(iliae) Proculae uxoris suae et | fil(iorum). Gallae et Galli et Coruncaniae et Nigellinae tribuna | et rostra | s(ua) p(ecunia) f(acienda) c(uravit)*. For a discussion of his *cursus*, the offices held, and the various communities in which he lived and served, see Pflaum 1968, 154–55.

294. Pflaum (1968, 154) argues that his place of origin is tied to his tribal affiliation (Galeria), his name (Gallus), and the formula expressing his equestrian status (*habens equum publicum*), which appears to be a unique case in Africa but is common in Narbonensis.

295. *CIL* 8.7987 = *ILAlg* 2.71.

296. Rives, 2001b, 431. Pflaum (1968, 156) suggests that priests dedicated to individual deified emperors indicated some special connection between the community and the emperor, possibly due to a particular benefaction.

297. There are four priests of Divus Julius from communities in Italy (*CIL* 5.4384, Brixia. Lucius Acutius Primus, *flamen divi Iuli*; *CIL* 5.4459, Brixia. Marcus Publicus

- Sextus Calpurnianus, *flamen divi Iuli*; AE 1975, 353, Caius Nonius Flaccus, *flamen divi Augusti et divi Iuli et divi Claudii*; CIL 9.2598, Teruentum. *Ignotus, sacerdotibus(?) divi Iuli*).
298. AE 1921, 25 (Carthage, dates to the reign of Hadrian); CIL 8.14364 (Carthage, dates to mid-2nd century CE); AE 1917–18, 23 (Carthage, 176–180?); AE 1941, 36 (Thuburbo Maius, dates to mid-2nd century CE).
299. Some of the priesthoods date to the mid-2nd century (such as a priest from Carthage: Bassignano 1974, 111; #15), whereas others are undatable (CIL 8.26604; AE 1973, 616).
300. Claudius: IRT 352 (Lepcis Magna, 101–102 CE). Nerva: CIL 8.26121 (170 CE). A priest of Nerva made a dedication to J(upiter) O(ptimus) M(aximus), Juno Regina, and Minerva for the health (*pro salute imperatoris*) of Marcus Aurelius in 170 CE.
301. CIL 8.14447: This inscription involves a dedication to Fortuna Redux on behalf of Severus Alexander by an unknown individual who held these three priesthoods, but the inscription is largely fragmentary and does not provide any other details.
302. Drinkwater 1979, 94.
303. For a discussion of the local careers of individuals in the Three Gauls, see Drinkwater 1979.
304. Pflaum 1968, 156.
305. Rives 1995, 58.
306. See Várhelyi 2010, appendix A.
307. For a table of the distribution of monumental inscriptions in the provinces, see Harris 1989, 268.
308. The exception is the deification of Trajan's biological father, Trajan, although in this case, if communities sought to connect themselves with Trajan's divine parentage, they would look to Nerva.
309. For a discussion of the practice of deifying children and its interpretation in the context of the tradition of *consolatio*, see McIntyre 2013.
310. CIL 8.22705: *Div(o) | Trai(a)|no P(atri?)*.
311. SHA. *Pert.* 15.3. *Filius Pertinacis patri flamen est factus*. (The son of Pertinax was made his father's priest.)
312. The first priests of Augustus were Germanicus and Livia (with Drusus taking over for Germanicus after his death in 19 CE).
313. For a catalog of temples and evidence for their existence, see Hänlein-Schäfer 1984.
314. ILS 112 = CIL I², 4333.
315. For a discussion of the *numen Augustum*, see Fishwick 2007.
316. ILS 112 = CIL I², 4333: *ceterae leges huic arae titulisq(ue) eadem sunt, quae sunt arae Dianae in Aventino*.
317. Livy 1.45.2–3; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.26.5; Cooley 2006, 244–45; Price 1996, 845.
318. An altar to Jupiter Optimus Maximus from Salona dating to 137 CE also references following the laws of the altar of Diana on the Aventine (ILS 4907: *ceterae leges huic area ea[e]dem sunt, quae arae Dianae sunt in Aventino monte dictae* [Price 1996, 845]). This can be understood in the same terms as the reference to “Gabine dress” mentioned in the honors granted to Lucius from Pisa discussed in chap. 1.
319. For a discussion of the importance of the antiquity of the cult and its continuing relevance, see Ando 2003, 339–40.

320. Fishwick 1982, 224; Keay 2003, 176; Mierse 1999, 131.
321. *RPC* 1.218 (Sestertius), dated to shortly after 15 CE.
322. Quint. *Inst.Or.* 6.3.77: *Et Augustus nuntiantibus Tarraconensibus palmam in ara eius enatam. Apparet, inquit, quam saepe accendatis.* (And Augustus, when the inhabitants of Tarraco announced that a palm had sprung up on the altar dedicated to him, replied, “It shows how often you set fire upon it.”)
323. There are a number of other temples and altars from the communities in the Spanish provinces (some examples are those found at Barcino, Augusta Emerita, and Cordoba). Although archaeologists have argued that they were connected to the worship of the imperial family, their dedications do not survive, making this identification problematic. Therefore, they are not discussed in detail here. For discussion of some of these religious cult centers, see Étienne 1958; Mierse 1999. For possible temples and altars in the Gallic provinces, see Derks 1998; van Andringa 2002.
324. One such example comes from the community of Thubursicum Bure (modern Tebursuk) and refers to an *ara divi Aug(usti)* but does not include any other information (*CIL* 8.15260).
325. *CIL* 8.26518; *ILAFr* 558.
326. Rives 2001b, 425.
327. *ILS* 6797. This altar is discussed in detail in Rives 1995, 111–13. Another possible altar to Claudius comes from the community of Ghardimaou, and although the inscription is extremely fragmentary, it appears that a *flamen Aug(usti)* is also mentioned who might be responsible for setting it up (*CIL* 8.14727; 52 CE).
328. Keay 2003, 179.
329. Étienne 1996, 153–63.
330. *CIL* 2.471. Mierse (1999, 71) summarizes some of the arguments surrounding the nature of this temple.
331. Richardson 1996, 141.
332. *ILAFr* 353. This altar, currently in the Musée du Bardo in Tunis, was found on the east slope of the Byrsa; due to its proximity to the shrine, scholars have assumed that these finds (along with the inscription) belonged together. Most scholars date them to the Augustan period (Rives 1995, 53). Publius Perelius Hedulus and his monuments to Augustus are also discussed in Smadja 1998, 975–76.
333. Zanker 1988, 316–20.
334. Rives 1995, 56.
335. *AE* 1925, 75: *Romae et Augusto Caesari divi f(ilio)*. After the deification of Livia, a second line was added: *et Divae Augustae*. Anderson (2001, 70–71) argues that this temple is also a later temple and may be incorrectly identified. However, he does not suggest a new interpretation.
336. Várhelyi 2010, 129.
337. *AE* 1951, 205 = *IRT* 319. See chap. 2, this vol., at note 76 for further discussion of this inscription.
338. *IRT* 596 (37 CE). *M(arcus) Fulvius Saturninus, flamen Ti(beri) Caesaris Aug(usti) d(ono) d(edit)*.
339. Sabinus Tapapius, *IRT* 341 (62 CE), and Tiberius Julius Frontinus, *IRT* 598 (2nd–3rd century CE).
340. The reconstructed text and translation of *IRT* 341 as presented in the *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* are as follows:

Neroni Claudio divi Claudi f(ilio) Germa[nici] nep(oti) Ti(beri) Caesaris
 pronep(oti) divi Aug(usti) ab[ne]poti Caesari Aug(usto) Germanico
 [p]ontif(ici) max(imo) trib(unicia) pot(estate) VIII [imp(eratori) · ? · ·]
 co(n)s(uli) IIII p(atri) p(atriciae)

Ser(uius) Cornelius Ser(ui) f(ilius) Lem(onia tribu) Orfitu[s · c. 8 · ·]
 quaestor divi Claud[i pr(aetor) u]rb(anus) co(n)s(ul) pontif(ex) sodalis
 Augustalis proco(n)s(ul) patronus [d]edicavit P(ublio) Silio Celere [legato ·
 ? · ·]

[· ? · ·] columnas et super columnia et super ostia in tribus [· c. 15 · ·
 It]hymba[Arinis f(ilius) Sabinus Tapapius flamen divi Aug(usti) sufetu [· ?
 · · fa]ciendas cura[uit] idemque cura[tor pecuniae publicae eas port[icus · ?
 · ·]

(To Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, son of deified Claudius, grandson of Germanicus, great-grandson of Tiberius Caesar, great-great-grandson of deified Augustus, chief priest, holding tribunician power for the eighth time, acclaimed victor ? times, consul four times, father of the country; Servius Cornelius Orfitus, son of Servius, of the Roman voting tribe Lemonia, [· ? · ·] quaestor of the deified Claudius, urban praetor, consul, priest, sodalis (Roman priest) of the cult of the Augusti, proconsul, patron, dedicated (it), Publius Silvius Celer [· ? · ·] his legate [· ? · ·] Ithymbal Sabinus Tapapius, son of Arin, flamen of the deified Augustus, sufete [· ? · ·], saw to the erection of the columns and the apertures above them and above these openings, in three [· ? · ·], and also as curator of public funds [· ? · ·] those porticoes [· ? · ·]).

341. IRT 352 (101–102 CE):

[Imp(eratore) Caesar]e divi N[eruae f(ilio)] N[e]r[ua] T[rai]an[o Augusto]
 |
 Germ(anico) pont(ifice) [max(imo)] tri[b(unicia) pot(estate) [- - -]]
 co(n)s(ule) IIII p(atre) [p(atriciae)] | [· ? · ·]s M(arci) f(ilius) Quir(ina tribu)
 Seue[rus f]lame[n] divi Clau[di] | [· ? · ·]m basilicae maioris a[mp]liiores [·
 c. 4·]s[ist]it [· ? · ·] | [· ? · ·]icae ther[ma · ? · ·]

342. IRT 275 (reign of Trajan or Hadrian?).

343. The reconstructed text and translation of IRT 347 (92 CE) as presented in the *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* are as follows:

Imp(eratore) Caesare divi Vespasiani [f(ilio) Domitiano Augusto
 Germanico] [pontif(ice) max(imo) trib(unicia) potest(ate) XI imp(eratore)
 XXI co(n)s(ule) XVI censore pe[rpetu]o patre patriae]

Ti(berius) Claudius Quir(ina) (tribu) Sestius Ti(beri) Claudi Sesti f(ilius)
 praefectus sacrorum flamen divi Vespasiani sufes flamen perpetuus amator
 patriae amator ciuium ornator patriae amator concordiae cui primo ordo et
 populus ob merita maiorum eius et ipsius lato clauo semper uti conce[ssit]
 podi(um) et aram d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(acienda) c(urauit)

(When Emperor Caesar Domitian Augustus Germanicus, son of deified

Vespasian, *pontifex maximus*, with tribunician power for the eleventh time, was named *imperator* for the twenty-first time, consul sixteen times, perpetual censor [and] father of the country [all erased].

Tiberius Claudius Sestius, of the Roman voting tribe Quirina, son of Tiberius Claudius Sestius, *praefectus sacrorum*, *flamen divi vespasiani*, *sufete*, *flamen perpetuus*, lover of his country, lover of its citizens, adorer of his country, lover of concord, who was the first [citizen] to whom the city council and the people gave permission to wear a broad purple band at all times, on account of the merits of his ancestors as well as his own. He saw to the making of the base and the altar at his own expense).

344. Some other examples of *flamines perpetui* are Gaius Marcius Dento, *IRT* 600 (end of 1st century CE); Lucius Septimius Severus, *IRT* 412, 413, 607 (203 CE); Lucius Aemilius Quintus, *IRT* 588 (383–388 CE); Titus Flavius Vibianus, *IRT* 567 (4th century CE); an *ignotus*, *IRT* 581 (unknown date); Lucius Volusius Gallus, *IRT* 579 (unknown date).
345. See Smadja 1978; Wilson 2012, 282–84. For an excellent discussion of the area of Tripolitania, how it was organized, and the communities found within it, including excellent site plans along with the traditional culture and religious practices and Roman influences on those practices, see Mattingly 1994. All the temples from this community are discussed in Brouquier-Reddé 1992.
346. Rives 2001b, 433–34.
347. *IPT* 22. A French translation and discussion can be found in Brouquier-Reddé 1992, 86–88. A discussion of the female images can be found in Kokkinos 1992, 110–12.
348. There is also a trilingual inscription in Latin, Neo-Punic, and Greek that may relate to a shrine or temple to the emperor (*delubrum caesaris* or ναός) but could equally refer to the temple of Roma and Augustus (*IRT* 481; *IPT* 16; *SEG* 9.802). For a discussion of these fragments, see Wilson 2012, 284–85.
349. *IRT* 273: *Dis Augustis | Q(uintus) Marcius C(aii) f(ilius) Barea co(n)s(ul) XVuir s(acris) f(aciundis) fetialis proco(n)s(ul) II patronus dedicauit | Iddibal Magonis f(ilius) Tapapius Lepcitanus de sua pecunia fecit* (To the Augustan gods. Quintus Marcius Barea, son of Gaius, consul, one of the *quindecimviri sacris faciundis*, a member of the fetial college, twice proconsul, dedicated [this]. Iddibal Tapapius Lepcitanus, son of Mago made [this] with his own money).
- It is securely dated by the second year of the proconsulship of Q. Marcius Barea. This temple is discussed in Fishwick, *ICLW* 2.1, 450–51.
350. Fishwick, *ICLW* 2.1, 451.
351. *IRT* 348: *Imp(eratori) Cae[sari divi]i Vespasiani f(ilio) Do[mitiano Aug(usto) Germ(anico) pont(ifici) max(imo) trib(unicia) pot(estate)] XIII Imp(eratori) XX[II co(n)s(uli) XVI cens(ori) perp(etuo)] p(atri) p(atriciae) et divo Vespasiano et di[vo Tito . . .] / ex testa[men Concor or mento Clau]diae Piaae i(c or f) [. . .] HS LXXX q[ui]bus addidit] pro honore sufetatus HS LX [. . .]* (Brouquier-Reddé 1992, 91–94).
352. Brouquier-Reddé 1992, 95–100.
353. Ward-Perkins 1993, 53.
354. For a study of the development of the deification of Roman women, see Flory 1995. The women officially deified in Rome (received the title *diva*) were Drusilla (sister of Caligula); Livia (wife of Augustus); Claudia (daughter of Nero); Poppaea (wife of Nero); Domitilla (wife of Vespasian?; see Wood 2010); Julia (daughter of

Titus); Marciana (sister of Trajan); Matidia (niece of Trajan); Plotina (wife of Trajan); Sabina (wife of Hadrian); Faustina (wife of Antoninus Pius); Faustina (wife of Marcus Aurelius); Julia Domna (wife of Septimius Severus); Julia Maesa (grandmother of Severus Alexander); Paulina (wife of Maximinus); and Mariniana (wife of Valerian I). Hemelrijk (2015, 74), referring to Varner (2001, 43) states that there are seventeen, but his list includes both Domitillas (wife and daughter of Vespasian), and there is no evidence suggesting that both were deified; rather, the modern scholarship is confused about which one was.

355. Over time, the increased number of female deifications helped further strengthen the role of women as a symbol of the dynasty (Hekster 2015, 321). This is especially apparent during the Antonine period.

356. There is literary evidence for priests (twenty in total, both men and women) dedicated to the worship of Drusilla (Dio 59.11.2–3) and priestesses (*flaminicae*) voted by the Senate to Faustina the Elder (along with games and a temple; SHA. *Ant.Pius* 6). Evidence for which individuals received the title *diva* largely comes from consecration coins, from lists found in the Arval Brethren inscriptions, and from literary sources (such as the brief mention of the deification of Julia Maesa in Hdn. 6.1.4).

357. For discussions on priestesses and social benefactions, responsibilities, and status, see Bielman and Frei-Stolba 1994; Hemelrijk 2005, 2006, 2015; Ladjimi Sebaï 1990; Spickermann 1994.

358. Tac. *Ann.* 5.2.1: *honoresque memoriae eius ab senatu large deretos quasi per modestiam imminuit, paucis admodum receptis et addito, ne caelestis religio decerneretur: sic ipsam maluisse.* (And as if through modesty, he lessened the honors of her memory abundantly decreed by the Senate, with no more than a few having been granted and with the addition that celestial rites ought not to be decreed, as she would not have wanted them.) For an analysis of Livia's exceptional honors and her role within the city of Rome, see Purcell 1986. For a discussion of Livia and the imperial cult, see Grether 1946.

359. Cass.Dio 59.11.1–4.

360. *CIL* 6.2028. This record in the Arval inscriptions is very fragmentary but has been reconstructed as *eodem die ob consecrationem Drusillae in templo divi Augusto novo*. For a detailed analysis of the surviving evidence relating to the worship of the imperial family by the Arval Brethren, see Scheid 1990.

361. Flory 1995, 134. The use of honors granted to Caligula's sisters and mother as a means of self-promotion is discussed in McIntyre 2010; Wood 1995.

362. There is an inscription stating that sacrifices were made by women who married in the colony of Ostia and their husbands to Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina, and although this inscription is beyond the scope of this study, it demonstrates the collective nature of the worship of the imperial family and serves as another example of living emperors being worshipped with the divine family members. *CIL* 14.5326: *decurionum decreto | Imp(eratori) Caesari T(ito) Aelio Hadriano Antonino Aug(usto) Pio P(atri) P(atriciae) | et Diva Faustinae ob insignem eorum concordiam | utique in ara virgines quae in colonia Ostiensi nubent | item mariti earum supplicent.* (By decree of the decurions, to Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrian Antoninus Augustus Pius, father of the fatherland, and Diva Faustina, because of their extraordinary *concordia*, so that on this altar, young women who marry in the colony of Ostia, in like manner to their husbands, shall worship.)

363. *CIL* 13.1194 (38–41 CE): *pro salute | Caesarum et p(opuli) R(omani) | Minervae et Divae | Drusillae sacrum | in perpetum | C(aius) Agileius Primus | (se)vir Aug(ustalis), c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum) d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit).* (For the health of the

Caesars and the Roman people. Sacred to Minerva and Diva Drusilla in perpetuity. Gaius Agileius Primus, *sevir Augustalis*, curator of the Roman citizens, gave [this] with his own money.)

364. Suet. *Cal.* 15.3. *De sororibus auctor fuit, ut omnibus sacramentis adiceretur: "Neque me liberosque meos cariores habebō quam Gaium habeo et sorores eius"; item relationibus consulum: "Quod bonum felixque sit C(aio) Caesari sororibusque eius."* (Concerning his sisters, he made it so that the following was added to all oaths, "And I will not hold myself or my children more dear than Gaius and his sisters," and likewise in the motions of the consuls, "In so far as it is good and favorable for Gaius Caesar and his sisters.") This is part of a larger section on the honors and offices granted by Caligula through a decree of the Senate to members of his family (such as his grandmother, Antonia; his uncle, Claudius; and his brother, Tiberius). For further discussion of oaths, their role in the practice of religious ritual, and the role of the emperor, see Cancik 2003, 29–45.
365. *CIL* 8.8929 (Saldae, Mauretania Sitifensis).
366. *CIL* 8.17847.
367. *CIL* 8.26225. *Divae Iuliae Domnae, dec(uriones) Gillitani s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecunt).*
368. Wood (1999, 12) suggests that any man or woman responsible for overseeing the duties of an official cult enjoyed social prestige that could then translate into political authority.
369. Hemelrijk (2015, 72–73) discusses the social status of imperial priestesses and the fact that some had only just become Roman citizens, suggesting that this might be a stepping-stone to further positions of influence and social standing within their communities.
370. Hemelrijk 2007, 344; Purcell 1986, 85. This connection with the imperial family is mirrored in the prestige of the emperor, which was reflected in the position of his priests (see chap. 3), although priests were never assimilated to the emperor in their statuary in the same way as priestesses of the female members of the imperial family were. The extent to which women in the provinces either copied their imperial counterparts wholesale or imitated them through some creative process is discussed in Cooley 2013. For example, there is evidence from at least two cities in the Greek-speaking world of Antonia being referred to as *euergetis* (Kokkinos 1992, 43–45; Wood 1999, 150; *IG* 12:2.207 (Lesbos. ca.18 CE); *IK* 3, no.88 (Ilium. ca.18 CE).
371. Livia as priestess of Divus Augustus (Cass.Dio 56.41.6); Antonia as priestess of Divus Augustus (Cass.Dio 59.3.3–4; Suet. *Cal.* 15.2); Agrippina as priestess of Divus Claudius (Suet. *Vesp.* 9). For a complete list of all the priests for any given year in Rome, see Rüpke 2005.
372. *CIL* 6.921 (51–52 CE).
373. Hemelrijk 2005, 2006b. Rives (2013, with bibliography) has also attempted to address the question of female involvement in public sacrifice, which has similar problems. Hemelrijk (2015, 82–95) discusses the priestly duties for all female priests (not just those associated with imperial cult).
374. These two titles are discussed in Hemelrijk 2006a. For a discussion of these titles with relation to the male priests, see also chap. 3.
375. The titles *flaminica* and *sacerdos* are not exclusive to the worship of the imperial family (such as the *[fla]minica sacer(dos) [de]ae Thucolis* from Antibes, *CIL* 12.5724).
376. *CIL* 8.1280 (Municipium Vallitanum; beginning of the 3rd century CE).
377. *CIL* 8.993 = *ILS* 4433 (Carpis; 2nd century CE).
378. *Flaminica divarum Augustarum*: *AE* 1966, 183 (Munigua, Baetica; unknown

- date). Priestess of the *domus Augusta*: *CIL* 2.1678 (Tucci, Baetica; 1st century CE).
379. *designata*: *CIL* 12.690, Spickermann 1994, 210; *prima*: *CIL* 13.5064, Spickermann 1994, 217; *bis*: *AE* 1916, 91; *perpetua*: mostly found in the provinces of Africa where the male priest title also included *perpetuus* (for example *AE* 1917–18, 23; *CIL* 8.25846; *AE* 1949, 36). Hemelrijk (2015, 75–78) discusses the priesthoods in order of prestige, with the provincial priesthood the most prestigious of all priesthoods and *perpetua* the most prestigious of the municipal priesthoods.
380. Hemelrijk 2005, 153.
381. For a discussion of the election and general background of priestesses in North Africa, see Ladjimi Sebäi 1990.
382. Hemelrijk 2006b, 89; Hemelrijk 2013 (for general female munificence).
383. In many cases, priestesses were attached to the equestrian class, and the granting of a priesthood may have led to political advancement for their families (Bielman and Frei-Stolba 1994, 124; Ladjimi Sebäi 1990, 667). However, Hemelrijk (2013, 67) argues that grouping female benefactors together with their families or suggesting that their munificence is a selfless act that promotes their male relatives obscures the position of these women within their communities and their contributions to civic life, whereas Witschel (2013) argues that at least in Africa (using Thamugadi and Cuicul as case studies), the inscriptions denoting female munificence are more concerned with the status, career, and position of male relatives.
384. Hemelrijk 2005, 2006a, b, with relevant bibliography.
385. *AE* 1916, 43.
386. For some examples from Africa of male relatives including their own offices in these types of inscriptions, see Witschel 2013.
387. For a list of priestesses and their husbands' priesthoods, see Hemelrijk 2005, 162–65. Many priestesses also had male relations who held imperial priesthoods (Hemelrijk 2005, 166–67).
388. As argued most recently in Fishwick, *ICLW* 3.2, 5.
389. *ILTun* 1406 = *CIL* 8.26529 = *AE* 1908, 164, and *AE* 1914, 176 = *IL Afr* 561 (Thugga, Africa Proconsularis; 173 CE): *Divo Vero fratri [Imp(eratoris)] Caes(aris) M(arci) Aur[el]li | Antonini [Au]g(usti) Armeni[a]ci Medici Par[t]hici maxim[i] Germanici [p]ont(ificis) max(im)i | t[r]ib(unicia) potest(ate) XXVII | imp(eratoris) VI cons[ul]is III p(atris) p(atriciae) proco(n)s(ulis) | Nanneia In[st]ania Fida ob honorem [fl]aminicatus colossos [---] | quos ex HS XXX mil(ibus) n(ummum) prom[isit] C(aius) | Terentius Iulianus pa[ter] h[er]es dedicavit. (To Divus Verus, brother of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus Armeniacus, Medicus, Parthicus maximus, Germanicus, *pontifex maximus*, holding tribunician power for the 27th time, emperor for the 6th time, consul for the 3rd time [173 CE], father of the fatherland, proconsul. Nanneia Instania Fida because of the honor of the flaminiate, vowed colossal statues . . . costing 30,000 HS. Gaius Terentius Iulianus, her father and heir, dedicated [this].) *AE* 1906, 12, provides similar information about the two statues, but this inscription is dedicated to Marcus Aurelius and includes his full divine heritage (brother of Divus Verus, son of Divus Antoninus Pius, grandson of Divus Trajan, great-grandson of Nerva).*
390. *AE* 1906, 12, provides similar information about the two statues and the dedication by Gaius Terentius Iulianus (*Nanneia Instantia Fida ob h[onorem] | flaminicatus(!) colossos duo[s] quos ex | HS XXX mil(ibus) n(ummum) prom[isit] C(aius) Ter[entius] Iu | [I]ulianus proheres d[edit]*). The first half of the inscription lists Marcus Aurelius's full name with all the same titles included in his position as brother of

Divus Verus from the other inscription but also includes the full list of Marcus Aurelius's divine ancestors.

391. AE 1910, 154 = *IL Afr* 300 = AE 1942–43, 98 (Sutunurca, Africa Proconsularis; 146 CE).
392. *CIL* 8.14690 = *ILS* 4484: *Mercurio sobrio, Genio Sesase, Pantheo Aug(usto) sac(ro) | pro salute imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) M(arci) Aureli Severi Antonini Aug(usti) Pii Felicis et | Iuliae Domnae Aug(ustae), matris Aug(usti) et castror(um) et senatus et | patriae totiusque domus divinae eorum, Lucilia Ca | le flam(inica) col(oniae) Thub(urbonis), templum a solo fecit libentiq(ue) animo v(otum) s(olvit)*. (To Mercury Sobrius, the Genius of Sesase, and sacred Pantheus Augustus. For the health of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Severus Antoninus Augustus Pius Felicis and Julia Domna Augusta, mother of Augustus, the camps, the Senate, and the fatherland, and of all their *domus divina*. Lucilia Cale, *flaminica* of the colony of Thuburbo, made this temple by herself, and cheerfully fulfilled this vow.)
393. This follows the general trend toward fewer priestesses of the imperial cult generally (both as a collective and as individuals). Hemelrijk (2015, 74) suggests that this decline occurred because the imperial cult was focused on the reigning emperor (and his deified predecessors) and that since there were more male *divi* than female *divae*, fewer priestesses were needed. The numbers she uses to support this statement are incorrect (she states that there are only seventeen *divae* to sixty-three *divi* but has misinterpreted the statements by Price [1987, 57] and Varner [2001, 43]). In both Price and Varner, they are referring to a total of 63 *divi* (with *divi* here serving as a masculine collective noun that also includes those women who were deified). Her statement of seventeen *divae* suggests that she is including both Domitillas—following Varner 2001, 43. However, there are only thirty-six *divi* who were emperors. The remaining ten (to make up the sixty-three total) were other members of the imperial family, some of whose identification as *divi* is contested (such as Aelius Caesar, the adopted son of Hadrian).
394. For a list of the names and titles of these priestesses as well as the locations of the inscriptions, dates, and references, see appendix 2.
395. Hemelrijk 2005, 154–55. More recently, Hemelrijk (2015, 74) has argued that imperial priests within these communities were likely responsible for the cult of the whole imperial family, including the women.
396. *CIL* 5.7345 (Caburum, mid-1st century CE?).
397. *CIL* 5.7788 (Albingaunum; late 1st–early 2nd century CE); AE 1997, 343.
398. *CIL* 5.2829 (Patavium; unknown date).
399. *CIL* 5.6514 = AE 1999, 763; *CIL* 9.1153 = AE 1993, 538 = AE 2000, 352.
400. *CIL* 11.6520 (Sassina).
401. AE 1991, 822 (Brixia).
402. *CIL* 5.7617 (Pollentia).
403. *CIL* 5.6514 = AE 1999, 763. See note 54 below for text and translation.
404. AE 1974, 348 (Mediolanum); *CIL* 10.54 (Valentia); *CIL* 10.5656 (Fabrateria Vetus); *CIL* 9.5248 = *ILS* 5652 (Falerio Picenus).
405. For example, the priestess of Diva Drusilla built a *piscina* (*CIL* 5.7345). For a detailed discussion of the benefactions and *summa honoraria* for all priestesses of the imperial cult, see Hemelrijk 2006b.
406. *CIL* 9.5248 = *ILS* 5652 and *CIL* 9.5429 (Falerio Picenus 140–161 CE): *Imp(eratori) Antonino Aug(usto) P[io] | Antonia Cn(aei) fil(ia) Picentina, C(?) C(?) . . . | Secundi praetori(i) viri, patron[i] colo | niae, sacerdos divae Fau[sti] | nae, statuas,*

- quas ad exo[ran] | dum theatrum promi[serat, Fa] | leriensibus posuit et [ob ded(icationem) | decurionibus plebi urbanae div[isionem] | dedit. (To Imperator Antoninus Augustus Pius. Antonia Picentina, daughter of Gnaeus, . . . praetorium vir, patron of the colony [referring to another individual mentioned in the missing part of the inscription]. priest of Diva Faustina, promised statues, which adorn the theater, she placed this in the Falerian district and because of the dedication by the decurions, the distribution of the urban plebs, she gave [this].)
407. CIL 5.6514 = AE 1999, 763: -----| [--fl]am(ini) | [divi] Had[riani] | fl[amini] | div[or(um)] Vespas(iani) e[t | Traian(i) p]atr(ono) [eq(uiti)] R(omano) | [et] Albuciae M(arci) f(iliae) | C[andidae] | f[fl]amini[cae] | diu[ae] Iuliae No[var(iae)] | fl[amini]c(ae) | d[i]vae Sabina[e] | Ticini | [--] + + + [--] + + + [--] |ER[---] |-----? (To flamen of Divus Hadrian, flamen of the divi Vespasian and Trajan, Roman patron of the equites, and to Albucia Candida, daughter of Marcus, flaminica of Diva Julia for Novaria, flaminica of Diva Sabina for Ticinum. . . .).
408. Hemelrijk (2005, 153) suggests that this priestess held the priesthood in Concordia before the one in Augusta Taurinorum, arguing that the priesthood in Augusta Taurinorum was dedicated to Diva Faustina Minor and that these priesthoods were held immediately following each empress's deification. She also suggests that this order may be explained by the status of the various communities.
409. For some ages of priestesses, see Hemelrijk 2005, 153 n. 52.
410. CIL 12.4249 (Baeterrae): Tulliae Q(uinti) f(iliae) | Aviae | flaminicae | Iuliae Augustae. CIL 12.1363 (Vasio; 14–51 CE): Catiae T(iti) fil(iae) Servatae, flaminicae | Iul(iae) Aug(ustae) vas(ensium) voc(ontiorum), Q(uinto) Secundio | Zmaragdo, (se)vir(o) aug(ustali), marito, eius Catius Severus frater et heres faciendum curavit, ex testamento (To Catia Servata, daughter of Titus, flaminica of Julia Augusta at Vasio of the Vocontii and to Quintus Secundius Zmaragdus, sevir Augustalis, her husband. Her brother Catius Severus and heir took care to have this made, from her will).
411. CIL 12.3302 (Nemausus; unknown date): . . . flam[in](ica?) divae Augustae . . . | . . . mater . . .
- CIL 12.1361 (Vasio; unknown date): ?[b]ellicae flaminic(ae) Divae Aug(ustae) prop(ter merita?)/pro p(ietate?).
412. CIL 2.1979: flamen di[vi] Aug(usti) p[raef](ectus) coh . . . | praef(ectus)] fabrum II [vir Quarti]lla mater sacerdos divae Aug(ustae) basil[ic]am cum hypa[ethro] . . . | . . . e]pulo dato d[edit] d[edicavit].
413. Hemelrijk 2006b, 97–98.
414. ILAlg 2.550 = CIL 8.19492 = CIL 8.6987 + p. 965: Divae Au[gustae] sacrum] | Q(uintus) Marcius C(ai) f(ilius) Barea co(n)s(ul) X[Vv]i[r] s(acris) f(aciundis) fetialis pro[co(n)s(ul) prov(inciae) Africae?] ded[icavit] | Coelia Sex(ti) f(ilia) Vi[cto]ria Potita flaminica di[vae] Augustae de sua pe[cunia] faciendum curavit. (Sacred to Diva Augusta. Quintus Marcius Barea, son of Gaius, consul, one of the quindecimviri sacris faciundis, a member of the fetial college, proconsul of the African province, dedicated [this]. Coelia Victoria Potita, daughter of Sextus, flaminica of Diva Augusta, took care to have [this] made with her own money.)
415. CIL 8.993 = ILS 4433 (Carpis, Africa Proconsularis; 2nd century CE): Aedem quam Cassia Maximula, flaminica divae Plotinae Caelesti Deae voverat, Sextili Martialis Mari | tus sacerdos publicus omnibus honoribus functus et martialis filius flamen perpetuus aedilis suo sumtu a solo aedificatam d(ono) d(edit) marmoribus et museis et statua pudicitiae aug(ustae) et thorace caelestis augustae ornaverunt et die dedicationis decurionibus sportulas dederunt. (Sextilus Martialis, her husband, public sacerdos, administering with all honors, and Martialis, her son, flamen perpetuus, aedile, gave this gift by himself, building the altar to the celestial goddess, which Cassia

Maximula, *flaminica* of Diva Plotina, had vowed. They adorned it with marbles, and mosaics, and a statue of Chaste Augusta, and the breastplate of Celestial Augusta, and they gave games on the day of the dedication by the decurions.)

416. The opposite is not true, and other than the two priests of Livia during her lifetime in Lusitania (chap. 2), no evidence for male priests dedicated to the cult of *divae* survives.
417. Bielman and Frei-Stolba 1994, 118; Ladjimi Sebaï 1990, 661–62. Hemelrijk (2005, 150–51) disagrees with this restoration and suggests that it should be restored as *flaminica Augustarum*, especially considering the other surviving evidence for this title from elsewhere.
418. *CIL* 8.5365 = 17495.
419. There are significant variations among these titles throughout the empire. To simplify the terminology used in this study **Augustales* (as found in Duthoy 1976) is used to refer to *Augustales*, *seviri Augustales*, *magistri Augustales*, and other variations. Without the asterisk, *Augustales* refers only to the group specifically described by this title. The *seviri* also appear to fulfill a similar role in the communities in which they are found and are included in this discussion.
420. For this reason, a summary table is not included in this discussion. For references to all of these inscriptions, see Duthoy 1976. There is no literary evidence for the **Augustales* besides a brief mention in Petronius's *Satyricon* that is extremely problematic. For whether Trimalchio can be seen as a typical freedman and *sevir Augustalis*, see Garnsey 1981, 370–71. D'Arms (1981, 99–120) puts Trimalchio into historical context and discusses the nature of social standing and the problems with using the *Satyricon* as a source.
421. Abramenko (1993b, 22–28) argues convincingly that *seviri* should be included in discussions of the **Augustales*, though he concludes incorrectly that the main distinction between the *seviri* and the other groups is that the *seviri* tend to be earlier in date.
422. Taylor 1914, 235. Ostrow (1990, 368) argues that the establishment of these groups should be understood within the context of the Augustan reforms: redefining and rebuilding the senatorial and equestrian orders, reorganizing the lesser officials who attended the magistrates, paying attention to matters touching on slavery and freedmen, and finally religious policy as a whole (which includes the establishment of emperor worship). Wallace-Hadrill (2005, 62) argues that the reforms should be interpreted within the context of a transformation in which members of the traditional elite (priests, politicians, legal authorities, and military leaders) were replaced by a broader elite with more specialized functions (*vicomagistri*, **Augustales*, and so forth). These reforms were part of Augustus's political goals, and he used the reforms to legitimize his position as he restored those things that were neglected by his enemies during the civil war (Scheid 2005, 177).
423. Scholars have varied opinions regarding the extent of this connection with emperor worship. Gradel (2002, 229) argues that an *Augustalis* (or one of the other titles) was neither an office nor a priesthood. Abramenko (1993b) argues against the religious aspects of these groups, stressing that the title named after the emperor does not necessarily prove that they were formally involved in emperor worship or that involvement in these cult practices was their primary function. Beard, North, and Price (1998, 2:208) agree that they are best regarded not as priests but as an “ordo,” which possibly (but not necessarily) had a religious role. Beard, North, and Price (1998, 1:358) suggest that the name *Augustales* may derive not from their connection with emperor worship but instead from their creation under Augustus. D'Arms (2000, 129) argues that this absence of focus on their religious roles is

misguided and, in light of some new inscriptions, that these *Augustales* had a very important religious role with respect to the cult practices associated with emperor worship. Patterson (2006, 243) states that the worship of the imperial family was not confined to one particular group but was an integral part of all aspects of both public and private life. Mouritsen (2006, 241) argues that the primary function of these groups was not religious, as there are a number of dedications made to the imperial family with no mention of the **Augustales*, and that most of the inscriptions referring to **Augustales* make no mention of involvement in the worship of the imperial family. However, he does not discuss the fact that one possible explanation for this absence is that most of the inscriptions referring to **Augustales* are honorific or funerary inscriptions and provide little information other than the existence of these groups and the titles given to individuals within these groups.

424. There are a few examples of **Augustales* from the eastern provinces, but all are from *coloniae* (or in one possible case, a *municipium*), suggesting that this office appears to be strictly a Roman phenomenon. Oliver (1958, 472–73) argues only a few **Augustales* exist in the East because a similar preexisting organization, the *gerousiae*, was already in place. This argument is problematic and takes into consideration neither the numerous differences between these groups nor the importance of legal status or location of the communities in which they were found.

425. One example of this is *CIL* 5.5859: *Faustus | (se)vir et Augustalis | qui inter primos | Augustales | a decurionib(us) | Augustalis factus est.*

426. A number of inscriptions were found in association with dedication plaques for theaters and other buildings (for example, in Stobi, Macedonia [*AE* 1990, 877], where three *Augustales* built a theater and dedicated it to Deus Caesar Augustus and the *municipium* of Stobi). One inscription from Italy (*AE* 1978, 439) states that Licinius Abascantio gave many games of all kinds because he was a *sevir Augustalis*.

427. Most of the scholarship gives 85–95 percent. For a statistical analysis and discussion, see Duthoy 1974. There is a great deal of variation among geographical regions. For example, a large number of freeborn **Augustales* come from northern Italy (Abramenko 1993b, 18–20), but very few are found in southern Italy (Patterson 2006, 248). An analysis based on social status is also difficult because many of the inscriptions do not state the status of the individual. There are a few instances where freedmen do hold office (Curubis, *CIL* 12 788; Carthage and Clupea, *CIL* 10.6104).

428. For two examples of this discussion, see Garnsey and Saller 1987, 121; Nock 1972, 354. From the Visellian Law onward (24 CE; *Cod. Iust.* 9.21), freedmen were barred from holding magisterial office (López Barja de Quiroga 1995, 328). Garnsey and Saller argue that these groups served the dual purposes of recognizing the superiority of the wealthy freedmen over the masses and of reflecting the most basic criterion for status, birth.

429. This is apparent in the provinces of Germany (see Amiri 2010). This office likely helped with self-promotion in a similar way to the imperial priesthoods discussed in chaps. 2–4. Holding this position allowed these individuals to commemorate themselves, promote themselves through self-representation, and increase their social mobility and that of their families (López Barja de Quiroga 1995; Mouritsen 2005).

430. This point is fairly undisputed, although the extent to which this terminology can be used to describe their function is still debated. For evidence of these groups referred to as a second order (*secundus ordo*), see *CIL* 13.4624 (Ostia). Garnsey and Saller (1987, 121) argue that it is an exaggeration to compare this group as a second order in the cities to that of the equestrians in Rome, partly because the *Augustales*

- had no upward mobility.
431. Mouritsen 2006, 237.
432. Abramenko 1993b; d'Arms 2000; Gradel 2002; Meiggs 1973; Mouritsen 2006; Ostrow 1985, 1990; Patterson 2006.
433. Ostrow 1985, 64–101.
434. Ostrow 1985, 75–76.
435. D'Arms, 2000, 127 (also includes the text, translation, and full commentary on the inscriptions).
436. *Miseni in templo Aug(usti) quod est Augustalium* (Ostrow 1985, 75). A shrine within the area may have been dedicated to Domitian but then rededicated following his *damnatio memoriae* (Camodeca 2000).
437. AE 1975, 211: *Aug(usto) sacrum | genio | Augustalium | Sex(tus) Gellius | Georgus | curator | Augustalium | anni sui | pecunia sua*. (Sacred to Augustus. To the Genius of the *Augustales*. Sextus Gellius Georgus, curator of the *Augustales*, in his year [as curator], with his own money, [gave this].)
438. This statue base is discussed in detail by d'Arms (2000). It is dated to 147–149 CE.
439. An annual wine party was to take place on the anniversary of his birthday for the *decuriones*, *populus*, and *Augustales corporati* (d'Arms 2000, 128).
440. For a discussion on the ideology and self-promotion of freedmen in epitaphs, see Mouritsen 2005.
441. *Placere Augustalibus Nymphidiam Monimen in corpore nostro adlegi*.
442. Described in Ostrow 1985, 77. AE 1979, 169: *Augusto Sacr(um) | A(ulus) A(ulus) Lucii A(uli) filii Men(enia) | Proculus et Iulianus | p(ecunia) s(ua) | dedicatione decurionibus et | Augustalibus cenam dederunt*. (Sacred to Augustus, Aulus Lucius Proculus, and Aulus Lucius Julianus, sons of Aulus, of the voting tribe Menenia, with their own money gave a banquet to the *decuriones* and *Augustales* at the dedication.) The importance of this inscription is discussed briefly in Keppie 1991, 58 (which also includes a photograph of the inscription itself).
- CIL 10.1411: *Divo Iulio | Augustales*
CIL 10.1412: *Divo Augusto | Augustales*
443. For full description, see Ostrow 1985, 78.
444. Wallace-Hadrill 2004, 121.
445. AE 2008, 357: *Vibidia Saturnina et A(ulus) Furius Saturninus | dedicatione imaginum Caesarum et Veneris decurionibus et Augustalibus (sestertium) XX et munic(ipibus sestertium --- et) Veneriis (sestertium) IIII dederunt*. (Vibidia Saturnina and Aulus Furius Saturninus, at the dedication of the *imagines* of the Caesars and of Venus, gave 20 sesterces to the *decuriones* and the *Augustales* and gave [?] sesterces to the residents of the *municipium* and gave 4 sesterces to the *Venerii*.)
- AE 2008, 258, from the temple of Venus itself, states that it was rebuilt and decorated at Vibidia and Aulus's expense.
446. Wallace-Hadrill 2005, 61.
447. The *Lares* and the **Augustales* are also linked in several inscriptions from areas outside of Rome. AE 1989, 340a: a dedication to the *Lares Augusti* by a *quattuorvir augustalis* in Centuripae; AE 1989, 346a: a dedication to the *Lares Augusti et Genius Caesaris liberorumque eius* by a *sevir primus*, unknown location. The second inscription shows the *Lares Augusti* and the *genius* of Caesar and his children being

worshipped together, thereby connecting the imperial family and the *Lares*. The date and location of this inscription are unknown, so it is uncertain which Caesar and which children are being referred to here.

448. For a more detailed discussion of these reforms, see Scheid 2005, 175–93; Wallace-Hadrill 2005, 55–84.
449. The area with the most inscriptions referring to **Augustales* (more than four hundred) and the most inscriptions overall is Regio I (Campania). The area with the fewest inscriptions (thirty-eight) is Regio III (Lucania). The other regions tend to follow closely the pattern of the number of inscriptions laid out in Harris 1989, 266.
450. This reorganization is discussed in detail in Taylor 1914. Duthoy 1976 summarizes the conclusions made by scholars in the 19th century and supports the idea of a reorganization at the beginning of the 2nd century CE.
451. Mouritsen 2006, 240.
452. Also found in Asculum Picenum on the Italian peninsula, *ILS* 6565: *sexvir Aug(usti) et Tib(eri)*.
453. *CIL* 13.4325 (Mediomatrici, unknown date).
454. *CIL* 12.1005 (unknown date): *[D(is) M(anibus) et me]morie aeterna[e | A] Jebuti Agathon[is | iiiiii] viro Aug(ustali) corp[(orato) coloniae Iul(iae) | Pat]er(nae) Arel(atensis) curat(ori) eius | [de]m corp(or)is bis, item iiiii[ii | vi] ro col(oniae) Iul(iae) Aptae, nau | [t]ae Ararico, curator[i] | peculi r(ei) p(ublicae) Glanico(rum), qui | vixit annos LXX | Aebutia Eutychia patro | no erga se pientissimo*. (To the divine shades and eternal memory of Aebutus Agatho, *sevir Augustalis corporatus* of the colony of Julia Paterna Arelata and curator of this group twice, *sevir Augustalis* of the colony of Julia Apta, sailor on the Arar [River], curator of the finances of the community of Glancier, who lived 70 years. Aebutia Eutychia [made this] for her most faithful patron.)
- Some other examples of **Augustales* serving in multiple communities in this general area are Marcus Silenius Symphorus (*AE* 1935, 17, in Lugdunum, Arelate, and Reis); Publius Sextius Florus (*CIL* 12.705, in Aquis and Arelate); Caius Aurelius Parthenius (*CIL* 12.3203, in Lugdunum and Narbo, Arausio, and Forum Iulii); Lucius Vercius Priscus (*CIL* 12.4424, in Narbo and Aquis).
455. Haeussler 2011, 399–400.
456. Some examples are Antipolis (*CIL* 12.181; *AE* 1988, 867); Aquae Sextiae (*CIL* 12.523, 530, 532); Arelate (*CIL* 12.689, 704, 1005); Massilia (*CIL* 12.400, 409); Narbo (*CIL* 12.4425); Nemausus (*CIL* 12.3197, 3201, 3213, 3221, 3235, 3236, 3244, 3258, 3277, 3281, 5904; *ILG* 430). See also Duthoy 1978, 1273–74; commentary on *AE* 1988, 867.
457. Duthoy 1978, 1274.
458. *CIL* 12.3235 (2nd century CE); *CIL* 12.3236 (2nd century CE).
459. Both *CIL* 2.181 and 182 date to sometime after 14 CE; *CIL* 2.183 and 2.196 can be dated to 56–57 CE.
460. The title is sometimes *universae curiae et Augustales* (*CIL* 8.1888, *CIL* 8.16558); *curiae universae et Augustales* (*CIL* 8.1880–84, *CIL* 8.16556), or *curiae et Augustales* (*CIL* 8.1889, *CIL* 8.16555, *CIL* 8.16559, *CIL* 8.16560).
461. *CIL* 8.1880–84.
462. *CIL* 8.16530 (Theveste; 180–182 CE).
463. *CIL* 8.18835 (Aquae Thibilitanae; 241 CE).
464. *AE* 1902, 144; *AE* 1902, 145 (Thamugadi; after 98 CE).

465. AE 1942, 18.
466. AE 1959, 46 (*Dianae Aug(ustae) sacrum*); CIL 8.21822 (*Isidi Aug(ustae) sacr(um)*).
467. CIL 8.305 (Ammaedara; 191–192 CE); AE 1955, 152, AE 1958, 144 (Hippo; after 161 CE); AE 1903, 106 (Utica; date unknown).
468. C. R. Whittaker 1997, 151. He is summarizing the conclusions drawn by Kotula 1981.
469. One possible example from Africa Proconsularis mentions *item curiis omnibus et augustalibus*, but the inscription is very fragmentary, and it is unclear whether this is the title of one group or two separate groups (AE 1958, 144).
470. CIL 13.1194 (see chapter 4, this volume, p. 95 at note 10).
471. Suet. *Cal.* 25.4: *Infantem autem, Iuliam Drusillam appellatam, per omnium dearum templa circumferens Minervae gremio imposuit alendamque et instituendam commendavit.* (Carrying this child, called Julia Drusilla, around through the temples of all the goddesses, he placed her on the lap of Minerva and entrusted her [to the care of the goddess] to be nourished and instructed.)
472. Macmullen 1982. For the references for dedications made to gods by the **Augustales*, see appendix 3.
473. CIL 12.1751 (160 CE).
474. CIL 8.16530.
475. CIL 12.4341 (98 CE).
476. AE 1906, 75 (161–165 CE): *T(ito) Fulvio Aurelio | Antonino Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) M(arci) Aureli Antonini | Aug(usti) f(ilio) | L(ucius) Aponius Rufinus | ob honorem seviratus | pec(unia) sua.* (To Titus Fulvius Aurelius Antoninus, son of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus. Lucius Aponius Rufinus [gave this] as part of his *summa honorum* as seviratus, with his own money.)
477. CIL 8.305 (191–193 CE): *Divo Pio | M(arco) Antonino | Aug(usto) Patri Imp(eratoris) | Caes(aris) L(uci) Aeli Au | reli Commodi | Pii Felicis Aug(usti) | Sarm(atici) Germ(anici) Max(im)i | Brittanici, p(atris) p(atriciae) | Augustales | pecunia sua | posuerunt.* (To Divus Pius, Marcus Antoninus Augustus, father of Emperor Caesar Lucius Aelius Aurelius Commodus Pius Felicis Augustus Sarmaticus, Germanicus, Maximus, Brittanicus, father of the fatherland. The *Augustales* placed [this] with their own money.)
478. AE 1966, 247 = AE 1965, 164: *Deo Marti Aug(usto) | et Genio col(legii) seur(orum) | Aug(ustalium) T(itus) Eppil(ius) Astrapton | fabr(i) et utric(larii) Latar(ensis) | [ob?] mer(ita?) eor(um).*
479. For a more in-depth discussion, see Fishwick, ICLW 2.1, 446–54. Cooley (2006, 230) suggests that both the emergence of this epithet in Rome and its spread throughout the provinces played crucial roles in shaping new imperial culture. The use of this epithet served to foster loyalty toward Augustus and his family by implying a link between the activities of the deity and the emperor and his family.
480. AE 1902, 145 (after 98 CE): *ordo | Augustalium sua | pecunia fecit.*
481. CIL 8.18835 (241 CE).
482. CIL 8.10516, 11528: *Astius Mustelus fl(amen) p(er)p(etuus) cristianus, vixit annis LXXII. Quievit VIII id(us) decembres, anno IIII d(omi)n(i) regis Idirix.* (Astius Mustelus, *flamen perpetuus cristianus*, lived 72 years. He was at peace [died] seven days before the ides of December, in the 4th year of the lord king Idirix [526 CE].)
483. The epigraphy of this area and period has been discussed most recently in Leone 2013; Trombley, 2011.

484. Clover 1982, 666. For a general discussion of the changing landscape and building programs in Late Antique North Africa, see Leone 2007, 2013; Lepelley 1979.
485. Although many shrines seem to have been closed during this period, others, such as those at Heliopolis and Carrhae, appear to have operated through the 5th and 6th centuries (Harl 1990, 14). In many cases, legislation banning sacrifices was a reaction to the practice of the use of sacrifice to divine the secrets of imperial succession (*Theodosian Code* 16.10.9, 12; McLynn 2009, 575).
486. Leone 2013, 101–10 (specifically relating to temples of the imperial cult).
487. It is difficult to determine how universally these laws were applied and how they were enforced. Although state-sanctioned buildings and public cults appear to have been in decline in some geographical areas during this period, they persisted in other areas. It is also difficult to know the actions of individuals and private cult practices.
488. *ILS* 705; Cameron 2011, 59.
489. Trombley 2011, 29–30.
490. Leone (2013, 12) argues that in Late Antiquity there was an emphasis on festivals in which both pagans and Christians could participate—that is, imperial cult practices and festivals connected to civic and historical events, as highlighted in the *Codex-Calendar*.
491. Trombley 2011. For example, an inscription from the early 4th century commemorates Titus Flavius Vibianus, who held a number of pagan priesthoods, including *sacerdos provinciae tripolitanae*, *flamen perpetuus*, and *pontifex*, among others. He was also a *curator rei publicae* (*IRT* 567, 568; Lepcis Magna). De Blois, conversely, argues for a change in imperial cult during the 3rd century and discusses the possible reasons behind the change, summarizing work done by Gradel and others (268–74). During this later period, emperors tend to connect themselves with other gods (not deified members of the imperial family). One such example is Elagabalus's connection with Elagabal (*CIL* 16.141). See also Turcan 1978, 996–1084.
492. For example, in 366 CE, thirty-six *flamines* were mentioned on a municipal list in Timgad.
493. Although there is no evidence that priests were responsible for overseeing this building, two temples of the imperial cult were rebuilt or restored during this late period (Thugga: *CIL* 8.15507, 26574a, *IL Afr* 513; Thignica, *CIL* 8.1411 = 14910, *ILTun* 1308).
494. *CIL* 8.2387 (found in the forum in Thamugadi): *Domitori hosti | um invicto | imp(eratori) indulgen | tissimo principi | d(omino) n(ostro) Fl(avio) Cl(audio) Iuliano | invicto pio fe | lici semper aug(usto) resp(ublica) et ordo co | loniae Tham(u)g(adis) curante, Fl(avius) | Aquilino, fl(amen) p(erpetuus), curator rei | pub(licae) posuit dedi | cavitque*. (To the unconquered vanquisher of enemies, Imperator, kindest *princeps*, our lord Flavius Claudius Julian, *Invictus*, *Pius*, *Felicitis*, always *Augustus*. The *res publica* and *ordo* of the colony Thamugadi having taken care. Flavius Aquilino, *flamen perpetuus*, curator of the *res publica*, set [this] up and dedicated [it].)
495. *CIL* 8.7014 = *ILS* 758 (Cirta, Numidia).
496. It is almost impossible to determine whether an imperial statue was a cult statue or a dedicatory statue (Trombley 2011, 21).
497. *CIL* 8.10489 = *ILS* 779 (378 CE).
498. For a discussion of *flamines perpetui* in Numidia during the imperial period, see Marcillet-Jaubert 1987. For a more general discussion of *flamines perpetui* in North

- Africa, see Bassignano 1974, 372–73.
499. AE 2004, 1792. In Lepti Minus, both Marcus Aemilius Superus and Marcus Aemilius Respectus are referred to as *flamen divi Augusti perpetuus* (CIL 8.1114). In some cases, the name of the community is also included in the title. Lucius Iunius Proculus Felicianus was a *flamen Augusti perpetuus municipii limisensis* (AE 2004, 1679).
500. CIL 8.58 = 11114 (Leptis minus; 1st–2nd century CE): *M(arco) Aemilio L(uci) f(ilio) Pal(atina) Supero | praef(ecto) fabr(um) flam(ini) divi Aug(usti) perp(etuo), fratri optimo | M(arcus) Aemilius L(uci) f(ilius) Pal(atina) Respectus praef(ectus) fabr(um), flamen perp(etuus) | divi Aug(usti), trib(unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae), fratri suo piissimo post mortem | eius fecit*. (To Marcus Aemilius Superus, son of Lucius, of the voting tribe Palatina, officer of the craftsmen, *flamen* of Divus Augustus *perpetuus*, to his greatest brother. Marcus Aemilius Respectus, son of Lucius, of the voting tribe Palatina, officer of the craftsmen, *flamen perpetuus* of Divus Augustus, military tribune of the 3rd legion Augusta, made [this] for his most pious brother after his death.) This inscription shows the inconsistency in priestly titles (one brother is *flamen divi augusti perpetuus*, the other *flamen perpetuus divi augusti*, although both titles likely refer to the same priesthood) as well as the importance of family promotion through commemorative monuments. This inscription is discussed (with expansions) in Bassignano 1974, 76–77.
501. AE 1908, 123 = CIL 8.22729 = ILS 9394 = ILTun 38 (Gigthis; reign of Hadrian). This inscription is discussed in detail in Bassignano 1974, 53–57.
502. CIL 8.12018 = ILS 4454 (Zama Regia; 2nd–3rd century CE). This inscription is discussed in Bassignano 1974, 79–80.
503. CIL 8.7963 = ILS 5473 = ILAlg 2.10 (Numidia, reign of Elagabalus or Alexander Severus). This inscription is discussed in Bassignano 1974, 242–48.
504. And one where the inscription breaks off right after the *divi*. CIL 8.12569 (Carthage; unknown date); Bassignano 1974, 114.
505. Jarrett 1971, 528; Lepelley 2001, 115–16. Clover (1982, 665) argues that just because an individual held this title does not mean that he participated in the religious responsibilities previously associated with it. In an earlier article, Lepelley (1992, 62) suggests that even though there was some secularization of *flamines* after Constantine, the veneration of the image of the emperor persisted, albeit without sacrifice.
506. At the time of Lepelley’s study (1979, 363), there were surviving inscriptions for 151 curators and 148 *flamines perpetui*.
507. Some examples from the imperial period are Marcus Virrius Flavius (a curator and *flamen perpetuus* in Thamugadi; CIL 8.2409); Lucius Octavius Felix Octavianus from Furnos, a *flamen divi Pii* and a curator (CIL 8.25808b); Lucius Flavius Gabinianus, a curator and *flamen perpetuus* (CIL 8.1165); and Quintus Paccius Victorius Candidianus, a *flamen divi Severi* and *curator rei publicae municipi sui furnitani minoris*. One individual in the 3rd century (260 CE) was a curator, *flamen perpetuus*, and *coloniae patronus* (CIL 8.20751).
508. Lucas 1940, 62–63.
509. Lepelley 1979, 150.
510. Benefactions *ob honorem flamonii* persist well into the late 4th century, but references to civic benefaction cease after 424 CE. For a list of public building benefactions, see Lepelley 1979, 304–14.
511. As Bassignano (1974, 372–73) has shown, the office of *flamen perpetuus* was often associated with other priesthoods or a municipal career.

512. Ibid., 372. For a discussion of priestly colleges as an aspect of the history of the senatorial elite rather than of Roman religion, see Cameron 2011, 139; Gordon 1990c, 221.
513. Lepelley 1992, 67.
514. For a discussion of patrons in North Africa from the Republican to Late Imperial periods, see Warmington 1954.
515. Chastagnol and Duval (1974, 110) argue that this institution had lost its religious aspects and became purely political by this stage. Jarrett (1971, 528) has argued that by this period, the title *flamen perpetuus* was hereditary and bore no religious significance. Lepelley (1979, 369) argues that although the flamine was still an important step in local careers, it served as a demonstration of loyalty rather than a religious office.
516. Trombley (2011, 48) suggests that in Late Antiquity, imperial cult practices were limited to burning incense in front of statues.
517. RPC 1.4846, from Caesarea Philippi. The obverse has a representation of a temple with two columns and the legend DIVA POPPAEA AUG; the reverse has a temple with six columns and the legend DIVA CLAUD NER F. For further discussion of this coin, see Burnett, et.al. 1992, 669–70; McIntyre 2013, 226–27.
518. Leone 2013, 91–99. For a discussion of the connection between provincial assemblies and imperial priests, see Deininger 1965.
519. Matthews (2000, 291) has argued that these laws were not universal and that the application of these laws was limited both in principle and in practice. In fact, we cannot know for certain the practical consequences of Theodosius's laws (McLynn 2009, 577).
520. Although scholars have argued that the legislation of the Theodosian Code was enforced and effective, Cameron (2011, 60, 72) has clearly demonstrated that the evidence for this conclusion has not been effectively argued or documented. See also Brown 1972, 310; Harries 1999, 93–96.
521. Harl 1990, 14.
522. For a discussion of the decision-making process and actions regarding the destruction of temples in North Africa, see Dossey 2010, 187–88.
523. Saradi-Mendelovici 1990, 47.
524. Salzman 2002, 20.
525. Trombley 2011, 30. In Vegetius's *De re militari*, the attitude toward honoring the emperor is made explicit (Veget. *mil.* 2.5). However, Christian reactions to the worship of the emperor were not always seen in this light. For a discussion of the role of imperial cult in the martyr acts, see Trombley 2011, 40–49.
526. For a history of the concept of divine election, see Fears 1977.
527. For discussion and commentary on these inscriptions, see Chastagnol and Duval 1974.
528. The attestations not discussed here are Tullus Adeodatus, a *sacerdotalis (provinciae Numidiae?)* from Cuicul, Numidia (*CIL* 8.8348); Julius Honorius, a *flamen perpetuus* from Uppenna (*Bull. arch. du comite des travaux historiques*, 1905, 376 n. 29); and Minucius Apronianus, a *flamen perpetuus* from Hr Baharine, Africa Proconsularis (*ILAFr* 490).
529. *CIL* 8.450, cf. 11523.
530. CRAI 1969, 435, fig.18; AE 1974, 691: *Astius Dinamius, [sacer]dotalis provi[ncie] Africe*.

531. This shift reflects a shift in all the titles associated with a number of offices, both political and religious (such as *iiviralis*, *aedilicius*, and *flaminalis*) (Duncan-Jones 1968, 153).
532. *CIL* 8.10516, 11528. Chastagnol and Duval (1974, 99–100) summarize some of the attempts at determining the family relationships here but demonstrate that many of the conclusions are not based on any concrete evidence.
533. Some examples are Mecenatia Secundula (unknown age at death), *cristiana fidelis* (*ILCV* 310a); Flavius Secundinus (aged thirty-six at death), *chrestianus* (*ILCV* 584); Aurelius Melitius (aged four at death), *cristaeanus fidelis* (*ILCV* 1334).
534. *ILAlg* 1.253 = *CIL* 8.5338 = 17488 (Calama, Numidia):] *perpetui victo|ris semper Aug(usti) | ordo Kalamensis | splendid(issimo) v(iro) s(pectabili), cum | Basil(io) Cirreniano res | tituto sacerdotali p(erpetuo) a. | cur(atore) reip(ublicae) dedicavit.* (. . . . *perpetuus*, victor, always *Augustus*, the *ordo* of Calama, to the most brilliant man that has been seen, restored [this] with Basilus Cirrenianus, *sacerdotalis perpetuus*, curator of the *respublica*, dedicated [this].)
535. *ILAlg* 1.254 = *CIL* 8.5337; *ILAlg* 1.256 = *CIL* 8.5335 (Calama, Numidia; 364 CE).
536. *ILAlg* 1.272 = *CIL* 8.5347 (Calama, Numidia).

Bibliography

- Abramenko, A. 1993a. "Die innere Organisation der Augustalität: Jahresamt und Gesamtorganisation." *Athenaeum* 81:13–37.
- Abramenko, A. 1993b. *Die munizipale Mittelschicht im kaiserzeitlichen Italien: Zu einem neuen Verständnis von Sevirat und Augustalität*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Alföldy, G. 1973. *Flamines provinciae Hispaniae Citerioris*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Español de Arqueología.
- American Journal of Philology*. 1999. *Special Issue: The Senatus Consultum de Gn. Piso Patre. Text, Translation, Discussion*. 120:1–162.
- Amiri, B. 2010. "Les servirii augustales dans les Germanies: Nouvelle études des inscriptions." *Klio* 92:94–103.
- Amy, R., and P. Gros. 1979. *La Maison Carrée de Nîmes*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Anderson, J. C., Jr. 2001. "Anachronism in the Roman Architecture of Gaul: The Date of the Maison Carrée at Nîmes." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 60:68–79.
- Ando, C. 2000. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ando, C. 2003. "A Religion for the Empire." In *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*, edited by A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik, 323–44. Leiden: Brill.
- Ando, C. 2007. "Exporting Roman Religion." In *A Companion to Roman Religion*, edited by J. Rüpke, 429–45. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Arena, P. 2009. "The *Pompa Circensis* and the *Domus Augusta* (1st–2nd Century A.D.)." In *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Heidelberg, July 5–7, 2007)*, edited by O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner, and C. Witschel, 77–93. Leiden: Brill.
- Bassignano, M. S. 1974. *Il Flaminato nelle Province Romane dell'Africa*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Beard, M. 1990. "Priesthood in the Roman Republic." In *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, edited by M. Beard and J. North, 17–48. London: Duckworth.
- Beard, M., J. North, and S. Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bénabou, M. 1976. *La Résistance Africaine à la Romanisation*. Paris: François Maspero.
- Bendlin, A. 1997. "Peripheral Centres—Central Peripheries: Religious Communication in the Roman Empire." In *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion*, edited by H. Cancik and J. Rüpke, 35–68. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Bickerman, E. 1973. "Consecratio." In *Le Culte des Souverains dans L'Empire Romain*,

- edited by W. den Boer, 1–25. Vandoeuvres: Fondation Hardt.
- Bickerman, E. 1974. "Diva Augusta Marciana." *AJPh* 95:362–76.
- Bielman, A., and R. Frei-Stolba. 1994. "Les flaminiques du culte impérial: Contribution au rôle de la femme sous l'Empire romain." *Études des Lettres* 2:113–26.
- Birley, A. R. 1997. *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*. London: Routledge.
- Boatwright, M. T. 1987. *Hadrian and the City of Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Boatwright, M. T. 1991. "The Imperial Women of the Early Second Century A.C." *AJPh* 112:513–40.
- Bosworth, B. 1999. "Augustus, the *Res Gestae*, and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis." *JRS* 89:1–18.
- Bowerstock, G. W. 1973. "Greek Intellectuals and the Imperial Cult in the Second Century A.D." In *Le Culte des Souverains dans L'Empire Romain*, edited by W. den Boer, 177–212. Vandoeuvres: Fondation Hardt.
- Brodd, J., and J. L. Reed, eds. 2011. *Rome and Religion: A Cross-Disciplinary Dialogue on the Imperial Cult*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Brouquier-Reddé, V. 1992. *Temples et cultes de Tripolitaine*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Brown, P. 1972. *Religion and Society in the Age of Augustine*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Burnett, A., M. Amandry, and P. P. Ripollès. 1992. *Roman Provincial Coinage*. Vol. 1, *From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius*. London: British Museum Press.
- Cameron, A. 2011. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Camia, F. 2011. *Theoi Sebastoi: Il culto degli imperatori romani in Grecia (Provincia Achaia) nel secundo secolo D.C.* Meletemata Series 65. Athens: Centre de Recherche de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine (Athenes).
- Camodeca, G. 2000. "Domiziano e il collegio degli Augustali di Miseno." In *Επιγραφαί: Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini*, edited by G. Paci, 171–87. Tivoli: Tipigraf.
- Cancik, H. 2003. "Der Kaiser-Eid: Zur Praxis der römischen Herrscherverehrung." In *Die Praxis der Herrscherverehrung in Rom und seinen Provinzen*, edited by H. Cancik and K. Hitzl, 29–45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Carreté, J.-M., S. Keay, and M. Millett. 1995. *A Roman Provincial Capital and Its Hinterland: The Survey of the Territory of Tarragona, Spain, 1985–1990*. *JRA* Supplementary Series 15. Ann Arbor: *JRA*.
- Castagnoli, F. 1984. "L'arco di Germanico in circo Flaminio." *Arch.Cl* 36:329–32.
- Chaniotis, A. 2009. "The Dynamics of Ritual in the Roman Empire." In *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Heidelberg, July 5–7, 2007)*, edited by O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner, and C. Witschel, 3–29. Leiden: Brill.
- Chastagnol, A., and N. Duval. 1974. "Les survivances du culte impérial dans l'Afrique du Nord à l'époque vandale." In *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne offerts à William Seston*, 87–

- Christol, M. 1999. "L'épigraphie et les débuts du culte impérial dans les colonies de vétérans en Narbonnaise." *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 32:11–20.
- Christol, M. 2006. "Épigraphie et réception de l'identité impériale (transmission, interprétation, et transformation): Auguste en Narbonnaise." In *La transmission de l'idéologie impériale dans l'Occident romain*, edited by M. Navarro Caballero and J.-M. Roddaz, 11–26. Bordeaux and Paris: Ausonius.
- Clauss, M. 1999. *Kaiser und Gott: Herrscherkult im römischen Reich*. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner.
- Clover, F. M. 1982. "Emperor Worship in Vandal Africa." In *Romanitas-Christianitas: Untersuchung zur Geschichte und Literatur der römischen Kaiserzeit: Johannes Straub zum 70 Geburtstag am 18. Oktober 1982 Gewidmet*, edited by G. Wirth, 661–74. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Cole, S. 2013. *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collar, A. 2013. *Religious Networks in the Roman Empire: The Spread of New Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooley, A. E. 2006. "Beyond Rome and Latium: Roman Religion in the Age of Augustus." In *Religion in Republican Italy*, edited by C. E. Schultz and P. B. Harvey Jr., 228–52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooley, A. E. 2013. "Women beyond Rome: Trend-Setters or Dedicated Followers of Fashion?" In *Women and the Roman City in the Latin West*, edited by E. Hemelrijk and G. Woolf, 23–46. Leiden: Brill.
- Corbier, M. 1994. "A propos de la *Tabula Siarensis*: Le Sénat, Germanicus, et la *domus Augusta*." In *Roma y las provincias: Realidad administrativa e ideología imperial (siglos I a.C.–I d.C.)*, edited by J. González, 39–85. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Cowan, E. 2009a. "Tacitus, Tiberius, and Augustus." *Classical Antiquity* 28:179–210.
- Cowan, E. 2009b. "Tiberius and Augustus in Tiberian Sources." *Historia* 58:468–85.
- Curchin, L. A. 1990. *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- d'Arms, J. H. 1981. *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- d'Arms, J. H. 2000. "Memory, Money, and Status at Misenum: Three New Inscriptions from the Collegium of the Augustales." *JRS* 90:126–44.
- Davies, P. J. E. 2000. *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments, from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Blois, L. 2006. "Emperorship in a Period of Crises: Changes in Emperor Worship, Imperial Ideology, and Perceptions of Imperial Authority in the Roman Empire in the 3rd Century AD." In *The Impact of Imperial Rome on Religions, Ritual, and Religious Life in the Roman Empire*, edited by L. de Blois, P. Funke, and J. Hahn, 269–78. Leiden: Brill.
- Deininger, J. 1965. *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Berlin: Beck.

- den Boer, W., ed. 1973. *Le Culte des Souverains dans L'Empire Romain*. Vandoeuvres: Fondation Hardt.
- Derks, T. 1998. *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices: The Transformation of Religious Ideas and Values in Roman Gaul*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Dossey, L. 2010. *Peasant and Empire in Christian North Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Drinkwater, J. F. 1979. "A Note on Local Careers in the Three Gauls under the Early Empire." *Britannia* 10:89–100.
- Drinkwater, J. F. 1983. *Roman Gaul: The Three Provinces, 58 BC–AD 260*. London: Croom Helm.
- Duncan-Jones, R. P. 1968. "The Chronology of the Priesthood of Africa Proconsularis under the Principate." *Epigraphische Studien* 5:151–58.
- Duthoy, R. 1974. "La fonction sociale de L'Augustalité." *Epigraphica* 36:134–54.
- Duthoy, R. 1976. "Recherches sur la répartition géographique et chronologique des termes sevir Augustales, Augustalis et sevir dans l'empire romain." *Epigraphische Studien* 11:143–214.
- Duthoy, R. 1978. "Les Augustales." *ANRW* 2.16.2:1254–1309.
- Étienne, R. 1958. *Le culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste a Dioclétien*. Paris: E. De Boccard.
- Étienne, R. 1996. "Du nouveau sur les débuts du culte impérial municipal dans la péninsule ibérique." In *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*, edited by A. Small, 153–63. *JRA Supplementary Series* 17. Ann Arbor: JRA.
- Étienne, R. 1999. "Un nouveau prêtre provincial du culte impérial de Bétique." *Pallas* 50:141–52.
- Everitt, A. 2009. *Hadrian and the Triumph of Rome*. New York: Random House.
- Ewald, B. C., and C. F. Noreña, eds. 2011. *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fears, J. R. 1977. *Princeps a diis electus: The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome*. Rome: American Academy.
- Fishwick, D. 1978. "The Development of Provincial Ruler Worship in the Western Roman Empire." *ANRW* 2.16.2:1201–53.
- Fishwick, D. 1982. "The Altar of Augustus and the Municipal Cult of Tarraco." *Madriider Mitteilungen* 23:223–33.
- Fishwick, D. 1984. "From Flamen to Sacerdos: The Title of the Provincial Priest of Africa Proconsularis." *Bulletin Archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* 17:337–44.
- Fishwick, D. 1985. "Le culte impérial sous Juba II et Ptolémée de Maurétanie: Le témoignage des Monnaies." *Bulletin Archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* 19B:225–33.
- Fishwick, D. 1987–2004. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill.

- Fishwick, D. 1996. "The Dedication of the Ara *Trium Galliarum*." *Latomus* 55:87–100.
- Fishwick, D. 1999. "The 'Temple of Augustus' at Tarraco." *Latomus* 58:121–38.
- Fishwick, D. 2007. "Numen Augustum." *ZPE* 160: 247–55.
- Flory, M. B. 1995. "The Deification of Roman Women." *AHB* 9:127–34.
- Fraschetti, A. 1989. "La Tabula Hebana, la Tabula Siarensis, e la durata del iustitium per la morte di Germanico." *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome: Antiquité* 100:867–89.
- Frenz, H. G. 1989. "The Honorary Arch at Mainz-Kastel." *JRA* 2:120–25.
- Friesen, S. J. 1993. *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia, and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family*. Leiden: Brill.
- Funaioli, G., ed. 1907. *Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Gagé, J. 1931. "Divus Augustus: L'idée dynastique chez les empereurs Julio-Claudiens." *Revue Archéologique* 34:11–41.
- Garnsey, P. 1981. "Independent Freedmen and the Economy of Roman Italy under the Principate." *Klio* 63:359–71.
- Garnsey, P., and R. Saller. 1987. *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society, and Culture*. London: Gerald Duckworth.
- Gesche, H. 1978. "Die Divinisierung der römischen Kaiser in ihrer Funktion als Herrschaftslegitimation." *Chiron* 8:377–90.
- Gonzalez, J. 1999. "Tacitus, Germanicus, Piso, and the Tabula Siarensis." *AJPh* 120:123–42.
- Gonzalez, J., and J. Arce, eds. 1988. *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis*. Madrid: CSIC, Centro de Estudios Históricos.
- Gonzalez, J., and M. H. Crawford. 1986. "The Lex Irnitana: A New Copy of the Flavian Municipal Law." *JRS* 76:147–243.
- Gordon, R. 1990a. "From Republic to Principate: Priesthood, Religion, and Ideology." In *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, edited by M. Beard and J. North, 179–98. London: Duckworth.
- Gordon, R. 1990b. "Religion in the Roman Empire: The Civic Compromise and Its Limits." In *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, edited by M. Beard and J. North, 233–55. London: Duckworth.
- Gordon, R. 1990c. "The Veil of Power: Emperors, Sacrificers, and Benefactors." In *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, edited by M. Beard and J. North, 201–31. London: Duckworth.
- Gradel, I. 2002. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Grether, G. 1946. "Livia and the Roman Imperial Cult." *AJPh* 67:222–52.
- Gros, P. 1990. "Théâtre et culte impérial en Gaule Narbonnaise et dans la péninsule ibérique." In *Stadt und Ideologie: Die Monumentalisierung hispanischer Städte zwischen Republik und Kaiserzeit: Kolloquium in Madrid 1987*, edited by W. Trillmich and P. Zanker, 381–90. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Komm. bei der C. H. Beck'schen Verlagsbuchhandlung.

- Günther, L.-M., and S. Plischke, ed. 2011. *Studien zum hellenistischen Herrscherkult: Verdichtung und Erweiterung von Traditionsgeflechten. Oikumene*. Berlin: Verlag Antike.
- Haensch, R. 1999. "Die Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium—ein typischer Statthaltersitz?" *Kölner Jahrbuch* 32:641–55.
- Haensch, R. 2007. "Inscriptions as Sources of Knowledge for Religions and Cults in the Roman World of Imperial Times." In *A Companion to Roman Religion*, edited by J. Rüpke, 176–87. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Haeussler, R. 2011. "Beyond 'Polis': Religion and *Sacerdotes Publici* in Southern Gaul." In *Priests and State in the Roman World*, edited by J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo, 391–428. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Hänlein-Schäfer, H. 1985. *Veneratio Augusti: Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers*. Rome: G. Bretschneider.
- Harl, K. W. 1990. "Sacrifice and Pagan Belief in Fifth and Sixth Century Byzantium." *Past and Present* 128:7–27.
- Harries, J. 1999. *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hekster, O. 2009. "Honouring Ancestors: The Dynamic of Deification." In *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Heidelberg, July 5–7, 2007)*, edited by O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner, and C. Witschel, 95–110. Leiden: Brill.
- Hekster, O. 2015. *Emperors and Ancestors: Roman Rulers and the Constraints of Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hekster, O., S. Schmidt-Hofner, and C. Witschel, eds. 2009. *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Heidelberg, July 5–7, 2007)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hemelrijk, E. 2005. "Priestesses of the Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Titles and Function." *L'Antiquité Classique* 74:137–70.
- Hemelrijk, E. 2006a. "Imperial Priestesses: A Preliminary Survey." In *The Impact of Imperial Rome on Religions, Ritual, and Religious Life in the Roman Empire*, edited by L. de Blois, P. Funke, and J. Hahn, 179–93. Leiden: Brill.
- Hemelrijk, E. 2006b. "Priestesses of the Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Benefactions and Public Honour." *L'Antiquité Classique* 75:85–117.
- Hemelrijk, E. 2007. "Local Empresses: Priestesses of the Imperial Cult in the Cities of the Latin West." *Phoenix* 61:318–49.
- Hemelrijk, E. 2009. "Women and Sacrifice in the Roman Empire." In *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Heidelberg, July 5–7, 2007)*, edited by O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner, and C. Witschel, 253–67. Leiden: Brill.
- Hemelrijk, E. 2013. "Female Munificence in the Cities of the Latin West." In *Women and the Roman City in the Latin West*, edited by E. Hemelrijk and G. Woolf, 65–84. Leiden: Brill.
- Hemelrijk, E. 2015. *Hidden Lives, Public Personae: Women and Civic Life in the Roman*

- West. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hemelrijk, E., and G. Woolf, eds. 2013. *Women and the Roman City in the Latin West*. Leiden: Brill.
- Herz, P. 1981. "Diva Drusilla: Ägyptisches und Römisches im Herrscherkult zur Zeit Caligulas." *Historia* 30:324–36.
- Hopkins, K. 1978. *Conquerors and Slaves*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jarrett, M. G. 1971. "Decurions and Priests." *AJPh* 92:513–38.
- Keay, S., ed. 1998. *The Archaeology of Early Roman Baetica*. JRA Supplementary Series 29. Portsmouth: JRA.
- Keay, S. 2003. "Recent Archaeological Work in Roman Iberia (1990–2002)." *JRS* 93:146–211.
- Keppie, L. 1991. *Understanding Roman Inscriptions*. London: B.T. Batsford.
- King, C. 2003. "The Organization of Roman Religious Beliefs." *Classical Antiquity* 22:275–312.
- Kleiner, F. S. 1989. "The Study of Roman Triumphal and Honorary Arches 50 Years after Kähler." *JRA* 2:195–206.
- Kokkinos, N. 1992. *Antonia Augusta: Portrait of a Great Roman Lady*. London: Routledge.
- Koortbojian, M. 2013. *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus: Precedents, Consequences, Implications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kotula, J. 1981. "Les Augustales de l'Afrique." *Bulletin Archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* 17b:345–58.
- Ladjimi Sebaï, L. 1990. "À propos du flaminat féminin dans les provinces Africaines." *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité* 102:651–86.
- Law, R. C. C. 1978. "North Africa in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, 323 BC to AD 305." In *The Cambridge History of Africa*, edited by J. D Fage, 2:148–209. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lebek, W. D. 1987. "Die drei Ehrenbogen für Germanicus." *ZPE* 67:129–48.
- Lebek, W. D. 1989. "Die postumen Ehrenbögen und der Triumph des Drusus Caesar (CIL VI 31200 B col., i.1–4; Tac. Ann. 4.9.2)." *ZPE* 78:83–91.
- Leone, A. 2007. *Changing Townscapes in North Africa from Late Antiquity to the Arab Conquest*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Leone, A. 2013. *The End of the Pagan City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lepelley, C. 1979. *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire*. Vol. 1, *La permanence d'une civilisation municipale*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.
- Lepelley, C. 1992. "The Survival and Fall of the Classical City in Late Roman Africa." In *The City in Late Antiquity*, edited by J. Rich. 50–76. London: Routledge.
- Lepelley, C. 2001. *Aspects de l'Afrique romaine: Les cités, la vie rurale, le christianisme*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Levene, D. S. 2012. "Defining the Divine in Rome: In Memoriam S. R. F. Price." *TAPA*

- Levick, B. 2007. *Julia Domna: Syrian Empress*. London: Routledge.
- López Barja de Quiroga, P. 1995. "Freedmen Social Mobility in Roman Italy." *Historia* 44:326–48.
- Lott, J. B. 2012. *Death and Dynasty in Early Imperial Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lozano, F. 2007. "Divi Augusti and Theoi Sebastoi: Roman Initiatives and Greek Answers." *Classical Quarterly* 57:139–52.
- Lucas, C. 1940. "Notes on the *Curatores Rei Publicae* of Roman Africa." *JRS* 30:56–74.
- Mackie, N. 1983. *Local Administration in Roman Spain, A.D. 14–212*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports International Series 172.
- MacMullen, R. 1982. "The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire." *AJPh* 103:233–46.
- Madsen, J. M. 2009. *Eager to Be Roman: Greek Responses to Roman Rule in Pontus and Bithynia*. London: Duckworth.
- Manton, E. L. 1988. *Roman North Africa*. London: B.A. Seaby.
- Marcillet-Jaubert, J. 1987. "Sur des flamines perpétuels de Numidie." *ZPE* 69:207–23.
- Matthews, J. F. 2000. *Laying Down the Law: A Study of the Theodosian Code*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mattingly, D. J. 1994. *Tripolitania*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mattingly, D. J., ed. 1997. *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*. *JRA* Supplementary Series 23. Portsmouth: *JRA*.
- Mattingly, D. J., and R. B. Hitchner. 1995. "Roman Africa: An Archaeological Review." *JRS* 85:165–213.
- McIntyre, G. 2010. "Constructing a Family: Representations of the Women of the Roman Imperial Family." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 21:109–20.
- McIntyre, G. 2013. "Deification as Consolation: The Divine Children of the Roman Imperial Family." *Historia* 62:222–240.
- McIntyre, G. Forthcoming. "Uniting the Army: The Use of Rituals Commemorating Germanicus to Create an Imperial Identity." In *Constructing (an) Imperial Identity?: Ritual and Identity Formation in the Roman World*, edited by A. Zuiderhoek and W. Vanacker. Farnham: Ashgate.
- McLynn, N. 2009. "Pagans in a Christian Empire." In *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, edited by P. Rousseau, 572–87. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McWilliam, J. 2010. "Family as Strategy: Image-Making and the Children of Germanicus." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 21:121–40.
- Meiggs, R. 1973. *Roman Ostia*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Meyer, E. A. 1990. "Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs." *JRS* 80:74–96.

- Mierse, W. 1999. *Temples and Towns in Roman Iberia: The Social and Architectural Dynamics of Sanctuary Designs from the Third Century BC to the Third Century AD*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Millar, F. 1977. *The Emperor in the Roman World*. London: Gerald Duckworth.
- Mouritsen, H. 2005. "Freedmen and Decurions: Epitaphs and Social History in Imperial Italy." *JRS* 95:38–63.
- Mouritsen, H. 2006. "Honores Libertini: Augustales and Seviri in Italy." *Hephaistos* 24:237–48.
- Nicols, J. 2006. "The Civic Religion and Civic Patronage." In *The Impact of Imperial Rome on Religions, Ritual, and Religious Life in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, 200 B.C.–A.D. 476), Münster, June 30–July 4, 2004*, edited by L. de Blois, P. Funke, and J. Hahn, 36–50. Leiden: Brill.
- Nock, A. D. 1972. "Seviri and Augustales." In *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 348–56. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Noreña, C. F. 2011. *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- North, J. A. 1975. "Praesens Divus." *JRS* 65:171–77.
- Oliver, J. H. 1958. "Gerusiae and Augustales." *Historia* 7:472–96.
- Oliver, J. H., and R. E. A. Palmer. 1954. "Text of the Tabula Hebana." *AJPh* 75:225–49.
- Osgood, J. 2006. *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrow, S. E. 1985. "Augustales along the Bay of Naples: A Case for their Early Growth." *Historia* 34:64–101.
- Ostrow, S. E. 1990. "The Augustales in the Augustan Scheme." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, edited by K. A. Raafaub and M. Toher, 364–79. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Patterson, J. R. 2006. *Landscapes and Cities: Rural Settlement and Civic Transformation in Early Imperial Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pelling, C. 2010. "The Spur of Fame: Annals 4.37–8." In *Ancient Historiography and Its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman*, edited by C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola, and C. Pelling, 364–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pflaum, H.-G. 1968. "Les Juges des cinq décuries originaires d'Afrique romaine." *Antiquités Africaines* 2:153–95.
- Price, S. R. F. 1984a. "Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult." *JHS* 104:79–95.
- Price, S. R. F. 1984b. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Price, S. R. F. 1987. "From Noble Funerals to Divine Cult: The Consecration of Roman Emperors." In *Rituals and Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, edited by D. Cannadine and S. Price, 56–105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Price, S. R. F. 1996. "The Place of Religion: Rome in the Early Empire." In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 10, *The Augustan Empire, 43 B.C.–A.D. 69*, edited by A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin, and A. Lintott, 812–47. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Purcell, N. 1986. "Livia and the Womanhood of Rome." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 32:78–105.
- Raggi, A. 2011. "'Religion' in Municipal Laws?" In *Priests and State in the Roman World*, edited by J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo, 333–43. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Ramage, E. S. 1985. "Augustus' Treatment of Julius Caesar." *Historia* 34:223–45.
- Ramsey, J. T., ed. 2003. *Cicero: Philippics I–II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramsey, J. T., and A. L. Licht. 1997. *The Comet of 44 B.C. and Caesar's Funeral Games*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Raven, S. 1993. *Rome in Africa*. London: Routledge.
- Rawson, B. 2003. *Children and Childhood in Roman Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Revell, L. 2009. *Roman Imperialism and Local Identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J. C. 1978. "Recherches sur certains aspects du culte impérial: Les funérailles des empereurs Romains aux deux premiers siècles de notre ère." *ANRW* 2.16.2:1121–34.
- Richardson, J. S. 1986. *Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218–82 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, J. S. 1996. *The Romans in Spain*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rives, J. 1995. *Religion and Authority in Roman Carthage from Augustus to Constantine*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Rives, J. 2001a. "Civic and Religious Life." In *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions*, edited by J. Bodel, 118–36. London: Routledge.
- Rives, J. 2001b. "Imperial Cult and Native Tradition in Roman North Africa." *Classical Journal* 96:425–36.
- Rives, J. 2013. "Women and Animal Sacrifice in Public Life." In *Women and the Roman City in the Latin West*, edited by E. Hemelrijk and G. Woolf, 129–46. Leiden: Brill.
- Rose, C. B. 1997. *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rowe, G. 2002. *Princes and Political Cultures: The New Tiberian Senatorial Decrees*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Rüpke, J. 1997. "Römische Religion und 'Reichsreligion': Begriffsgeschichtliche und methodische Bemerkungen." In *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion*, edited by H. Cancik and J. Rüpke, 3–23. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Rüpke, J. 2005. *Fasti sacerdotum: Die Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Funktionspersonal römischer, griechischer, orientalischer, und jüdisch-christlicher Kulte in der Stadt Rom von 300 v. Chr. bis 499 n. Chr.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

- Rüpke, J. 2006a. "Religion in the *Lex Ursonensis*." In *Religion and Law in Classical and Christian Rome*, edited by C. Ando and J. Rüpke, 34–46. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Rüpke, J. 2006b. "Urban Religion and Imperial Expansion: Priesthoods in the *Lex Ursonensis*." In *The Impact of Imperial Rome on Religions, Ritual, and Religious Life in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, 200 B.C.–A.D. 476), Münster, June 30–July 4, 2004*, edited by L. de Blois, P. Funke, and J. Hahn, 11–23. Leiden: Brill.
- Salzman, M. 2002. *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy: Social and Religious Change in the Western Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saradi-Mendelovici, H. 1990. "Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and Their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44:47–61.
- Scheid, J. 1984. "Le prêtre et le magistrat: Réflexions sur les sacerdoces et le droit public à la fin de la République." In *Des ordres à Rome*, edited by C. Nicolet, 243–80. Paris: La Sorbonne.
- Scheid, J. 1990. *Romulus et ses frères: Le collège des frères arvaies, modèle du culte public dans la Rome des empereurs*. Rome: École Française.
- Scheid, J. 1995. "Graeco Ritu: A Typically Roman Way of Honouring the Gods." *HSCP* 97:15–31.
- Scheid, J. 1999. "Aspects religieux de la municipalisation: Quelques réflexions générales." In *Cités, municipes, colonies*, edited by M. Dondin-Payre and M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier, 381–423. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Scheid, J. 2003. *An Introduction to Roman Religion*. Translated by J. Lloyd. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Scheid, J. 2005. "Augustus and Roman Religion: Continuity, Conservatism, and Innovation." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by K. Galinsky, 175–93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Severy, B. 2000. "Family and State in the Early Imperial Monarchy: The Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre, Tabula Siarensis, and Tabula Hebana." *Classical Philology* 95:318–37.
- Severy, B. 2003. *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge.
- Sherk, R. K. 1988. *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smadja, E. 1978. "L'inscription du culte impérial dans la cité: l'exemple de Lepcis Magna au début de l'Empire." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 4:171–86.
- Smadja, E. 1985. "L'empereur et les dieux en Afrique romaine." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 11:541–55.
- Smadja, E. 1998. "Dépendance et culte impérial en Afrique." *L'Africa Romana* 12.2:973–83.
- Smadja, E. 2005a. "Le culte impérial en Afrique." *Pallas* 68:333–49.
- Smadja, E. 2005b. "Culte impérial et religion en Afrique du Nord sous le Haut Empire romain." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, supplément 1, 225–37.

Small, A., ed. 1996. *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*. JRA Supplementary Series 17. Ann Arbor: JRA.

Spickermann, W. 1994. "Priesterinnen im römischen Gallien, Germanien, und den Alpenprovinzen (1.-3. Jahrhundert. n.Chr.)." *Historia* 43:189–240.

Sumi, G. S. 2005. *Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Szemler, G. J. 1972. *The Priests of the Roman Republic: A Study of Interactions between Priesthoods and Magistracies*. Brussels: Latomus.

Taylor, L. R. 1914. "Augustales, Seviri Augustales, and Seviri: A Chronological Study." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 45:231–53.

Taylor, L. R. 1931. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown: American Philological Association.

Toynbee, J. M. C. 1971. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Trillmich, W., and P. Zanker. 1990. *Stadt und Ideologie: Die Monumentalisierung hispanischer Städte zwischen Republik und Kaiserzeit: Kolloquium in Madrid 1987*. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Komm. bei der C. H. Beckschen.

Trombley, F. R. 2011. "The Imperial Cult in Late Roman Religion (ca. 244–395): Observations on the Epigraphy." In *Spätantiker Staat und religiöser Konflikt: Imperiale und lokale Verwaltung und die Gewalt gegen Heliolatrie*, edited by J. Hahn, 19–54. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Turcan, R. 1978. "Le culte imperial au IIIe siècle." *ANRW* 2.16.2:996–1084.

van Andringa, W. 1999. "Prêtrises et cités dans les Trois Gaules et les Germanies au Haut Empire." In *Cités, Municipales, Colonies*, edited by M. Dondin-Payre and M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier, 425–46. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.

van Andringa, W. 2002. *La religion en Gaule romaine: Piété et politique (Ier—IIIe siècle apr. J.-C)*. Paris: Editions Errance.

Várhelyi, Z. 2010. *The Religion of Senators in the Roman Empire: Power and the Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Varner, E. R. 2001. "Portraits, Plots, and Politics: 'Damnatio Memoriae' and the Images of Imperial Women." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 46:41–93.

von Premerstein, A. 1893. "Augustales." *Dizionario Epigrafico* 1:824–77.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1990. "Roman Arches and Greek Honours: The Language of Power at Rome." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 36:143–81.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2004. "Imaginary Feasts: Pictures of Success on the Bay of Naples." In *Ostia, Cicero, Gamala, Feasts, and the Economy: Papers in Memory of John H. D'Arms*, edited by A. Gallina Zevi and J. H. Humphrey, 109–26. JRA Supplementary Series 57. Portsmouth: JRA.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2005. "Mutatas Formas: The Augustan Transformation of Roman Knowledge." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by K. Galinsky, 55–84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ward-Perkins, J. B. 1993. *The Severan Buildings of Lepcis Magna: An Architectural Survey*. London: Society for Libyan Studies.
- Wardle, D. 2002. "Deus or Divus: The Genesis of Roman Terminology for Deified Emperors and a Philosopher's Contribution." In *Philosophy and Power in the Graeco-Roman World*, edited by G. Clark and T. Rajak, 181–91. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wardle, D. 2009. "Caesar and Religion." In *A Companion to Julius Caesar*, edited by M. Griffin, 100–111. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Warmington, B. H. 1954. *The North African Provinces from Diocletian to the Vandal Conquest*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Webster, J. 1997. "A Negotiated Syncretism: Readings on the Development of Romano-Celtic Religion." In *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. J. Mattingly, 165–84. *JRA* Supplementary Series 23. Portsmouth: *JRA*.
- Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- White, P. 1988. "Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome." *Phoenix* 42:334–56.
- Whittaker, C. R. 1996. *Roman Africa: Augustus to Vespasian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whittaker, C. R. 1997. "Imperialism and Culture: The Roman Initiative." In *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. J. Mattingly, 143–63. *JRA* Supplementary Series 23. Portsmouth: *JRA*.
- Whittaker, H. 1996. "Two Notes on Octavian and the Cult of Divus Iulius." *Symbolae Osloenses* 71:87–99.
- Williamson, C. H. 1987. "A Roman Law from Narbonne." *Athenaeum* 65:173–89.
- Wilson, A. 2012. "Neo-Punic and Latin in Roman North Africa: Function and Display." In *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*, edited by A. Mullen and P. James, 265–316. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Witschel, C. 2013. "The Public Presence of Women in the Cities of Roman North Africa: Two Case Studies: Thamugadi and Cuicul." In *Women and the Roman City in the Latin West*, edited by E. Hemelrijk and G. Woolf, 85–106. Leiden: Brill.
- Wood, S. E. 1995. "Diva Drusilla Panthea and the Sisters of Caligula." *AJA* 99:457–82.
- Wood, S. E. 1999. *Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 BC–AD 68*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wood, S. E. 2010. "Who Was Diva Domitilla?: Some Thoughts on the Public Images of the Flavian Women." *AJA* 114:45–57.
- Woolf, G. 1998. *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Index Locorum

Literary

Appian

Bellum Civile

2.106: 19

2.143–48: 21–22

3.2–3: 22–23

Aulus Gellius

Noctes Atticae

10.15: 64

Cassius Dio

41.61.4: 22

43.14.6: 16

43.21.2: 18

43.42.3–45.3: 18

44.6.2–4: 19, [63](#)

44.51.2: 22

47.18.1–19.3: 16, [24](#)

51.19–20: 7, [36](#), [41](#), [56](#)

53.30.5–6: 26, [46](#)

54.32.1: 10, [51](#)

55.27: 60

56.25: 60

56.34.1–4: 7

56.41: 16, [97](#)

56.42.3: 24

56.43.1–4: 25

56.46.1: 10

58.11.6–7: 55

59.3.3–4: 97

59.11.1–4: 7, [24](#), [93–94](#)

65.14.1–2: 55

69.11.2–4: 42

75.4.2–5.5: 7

Cicero

Letters to Atticus

14.6–8: 22

Philippics

1.5: 22

2.110: 18, [20](#)

Dionysius of Halicarnassus

Antiquitates Romanae

4.26.5: 81

Festus

92 L: 64

Herodian

4.2.1–11: 7

6.1.4: 93

Josephus

Antiquitates Judaicae

18.181–82: 55

Livy

1.45.2–3: 81

31.50.7: 64

Ovid

Fasti

2.533–70: 29

Pliny (the Elder)

Naturalis Historia

2.93–94: 23–24

Plutarch

Antonius

33.1: 20

Caesar

57.3: 19

67.4: 20–21

69.3: 23–24

Quaestiones Romanae

275 C–D: 64

Propertius

4.6.59–60: 23

Quintilian

Institutio Oratoria

6.3.77: 82

Servius

In Vergilium Commentarius

5.45: 17

12.139: 17

Scriptores Historiae Augustae

Antoninus Pius

6: 93

Hadrian

14.5–7: 42

27.2–4: 7

Marcus

7.11: 10

Pertinax

15.3: 79

Strabo

4.3.2: 10, [51](#)

Suetonius

Divus Julius

76: 20

84: 21–22

85: 22

88: 23–24

Divus Augustus

52: 7

100: 25

Gaius Caligula

15: 96–97

25: 124–25

Divus Claudius

2: 10, [51](#)

Domitianus

13: 17

Divus Vespasianus

9: 97

Tacitus

Annales

1.54: 43

1.76–79: 33–35, [72–73](#)

2.43: 54

2.73.1: 48

2.82: 54

2.83: 45–46

3.15: 54

3.17: 54

3.66–69: 35

4.9: 48

4.15: 35

4.34–36: 36

4.37: 35–38, [49](#)

5.2.1: 94

12.27: 56
13.2: 56
15.23: 20
Germania
28: 56
Valerius Maximus
9.15.1: 22–23
Varro
De Lingua Latina
Fr. 1: 17
Fr. 424: 17
Vegetius
De Re Militari
2.5: 142
Velleius Paterculus
2.126: 25
2.130: 54
Virgil
Eclogues
9.46–49: 23
Vitruvius
3.3.2: 25

Nonliterary

AE
1902, [144](#): 123
1902, [145](#): 123, [127](#)
1903, [106](#): 123
1906, [12](#): 101
1906, [75](#): 126
1908, [123](#): 138
1908, [164](#): 101
1910, [78](#): 75
1910, [154](#): 101
1914, [176](#): 101
1915, [95](#): 37, [50](#)
1916, [43](#): 100
1916, [91](#): 59, [99](#)
1917–18, [23](#): 75–76, [99](#)
1921, [25](#): 75–76
1925, [75](#): 85
1928, [34](#): 70
1935, [17](#): 120

1941, [36](#): 75–76
1942, [18](#): 123
1942–43, [98](#): 101
1949, [36](#): 99
1951, [81](#): 53
1951, 205: 57–58, [86](#)
1952, [169](#): 18
1955, [152](#): 123
1958, [144](#): 123–24
1959, [46](#): 123
1965, [164](#): 127
1966, [183](#): 98
1966, 247: 127
1973, 616: 76
1974, 348: 103
1974, 691: 143
1975, 211: 115
1975, 353: 75
1978, 439: 113
1979, [169](#): 116
1980, 615: 55
1980, 626: 43
1982, 520: 67, [69](#)
1983, 519: 67, [69](#)
1988, 867: 121
1989, 340a: 117
1989, 346a: 117
1990, 877: 113
1991, 822: 103
1993, 538: 103
1997, 343: 103
1997, 397: 55
1999, 763: 103–4
2000, 352: 103
2004, 1679: 138
2004, 1792: 138
2008, 258: 116–17
2008, 357: 116–17

CIL

I². 788: 113
I². 4333: 80–81
2.49: 38, [51](#)

2.181: 122
2.182: 122
2.183: 122
2.194: 37, [49](#)
2.196: 122
2.260: 68
2.471: 83
2.1475: 69
2.1534: 69
2.1663: 69
2.1678: 98
2.1979: 106
2.2038: 59–60
2.2039: 59–60
2.2040: 60
2.2105: 67, [69](#)
2.3350: 68
2.3362: 69
2.4212: 74
2.4217: 73–74
2.4274: 73–74
2.4279: 73–74
2.5120: 67, [69](#)
2.6072: 73–74
2.6095: 73–74
 Π^2 5, [29](#): 69
 Π^2 5, [69](#): 69
 Π^2 5, 1171: 69
 Π^2 7, [68](#): 67, [69](#)
 Π^2 14, 1132: 73–74
 Π^2 14, 1139: 73–74
 Π^2 14, 1217: 73–74
3.3345: 66
5.2829: 103
5.4384: 75
5.4459: 75
5.5126: 65
5.5859: 113
5.6514: 103–4
5.7345: 103
5.7617: 103
5.7788: 103
6.921: 97

6.2028: 94
6.31200: 48
8.58: 138
8.305: 123, [126](#)
8.450: 142
8.993: 98, [107](#)
8.1114: 138
8.1165: 139
8.1280: 98
8.1411: 137
8.1880–84: 122
8.1888: 122
8.1889: 122
8.2387: 137
8.2409: 139
8.5335: 144
8.5337: 144
8.5338: 143–44
8.5347: 144
8.5365: 108
8.6987: 106
8.7014: 137
8.7963: 138
8.7987: 75
8.8348: 142
8.8929: 96
8.10489: 138
8.10516: 135, [143](#)
8.11114: 138
8.11523: 142
8.11528: 135, [143](#)
8.12018: 138
8.12569: 138
8.14364: 75–76
8.14447: 76
8.14727: 82
8.14910: 137
8.15260: 82
8.15507: 137
8.16530: 122, [125](#)
8.16555: 122
8.16556: 122
8.16558: 122

8.16559: 122
8.16560: 122
8.17488: 143–44
8.17495: 108
8.17847: 96
8.18835: 123, [128](#)
8.19492: 106
8.20751: 139
8.21822: 123
8.22729: 138
8.25379: 2
8.25808: 9
8.25808b: 139
8.25844: 61
8.25846: 99
8.26121: 76
8.26225: 96
8.26518: 61, [82](#)
8.26529: 101
8.26574a: 137
8.26604: 76
9.1153: 103
9.2598: 75
9.5248: 103–4
9.5429: 103–4
10.54: 103
10.840: 57
10.943–6: 57
10.1411: 116
10.1412: 116
10.3757: 26
10.5656: 103
10.6104: 113
11.6520: 103
12.140: 68
12.181: 121
12.400: 121
12.409: 121
12.523: 121
12.530: 121
12.532: 121
12.689: 121
12.690: 99

12.704: 121
12.705: 120
12.1005: 120–21
12.1361: 106
12.1363: 53, [105](#)
12.1751: 125
12.1872: 44, [68](#)
12.2606: 68
12.2607: 68
12.2675: 68
12.3180: 44, [68](#)
12.3197: 121
12.3201: 121
12.3203: 120
12.3207: 44
12.3212: 65, [68](#)
12.3213: 68, [121](#)
12.3221: 121
12.3235: 121
12.3236: 121
12.3244: 121
12.3258: 121
12.3277: 121
12.3281: 121
12.3302: 106
12.4229: 53
12.4230: 58
12.4249: 53, [105](#)
12.4341: 126
12.4424: 120
12.4425: 121
12.4426: 58
12.5724: 98
12.5904: 121
12.6038: 64
13.1036: 43
13.1194: 95, [124](#)
13.2114: 42
13.2181: 53–54
13.3254: 30
13.3671: 30
13.4325: 120
13.4624: 114

13.5064: 99

14.5326: 95

16.141: 137

Codex Iustinianus: 113

CRAI

1969, 435: 143

Feriale Duranum: 48

IG

12.2.207: 97

IK

3, no. 88: 97

ILAfr

300: 101

490: 142

513: 137

353: 84

558: 61, [82](#)

561: 101

ILAlg

1 256: 144

1.253: 143–44

1.254: 144

1.272: 144

2.10: 138

2.71: 75

2.550: 106

ILCV

310a: 143

584: 143

1334: 143

ILGN

634: 59

635: 55

638: 55

ILS

72: 20

73: 20

112: 80–81

137: 26

139: 27–29

140: 26, [28–32](#)

705: 136

758: 137
779: 138
4433: 98, [107](#)
4454: 138
4907: 81
5473: 138
5652: 103–4
6565: 120
6797: 82
9394: 138

ILTun

38: 138
1308: 137
1406: 101

IPT

16: 90
22: 89

IRT

273: 90
275: 88
319: 57–58, [86](#)
341: 86–87
347: 88–89
348: 90
352: 76, [87](#)
412: 89
413: 89
481: 90
567: 89, [137](#)
568: 137
579: 89
581: 89
588: 89
596: 60, [86](#)
598: 86
600: 89
607: 89

Lex Ursonensis: 64–65

Res Gestae: 25

SCPP: 54

SEG

9.802: 90

Tabula Hebana: 46

Tabula Siarensis: 45–47

Tabula Ilicitana: 48

Theodosian Code: 136, [141](#)

General Index

Personal names are indexed under the *nomen gentile* or family name in most cases, with the exception of emperors and imperial family members who are indexed under the name by which they are most commonly known. This list only includes those individuals who held an imperial priesthood for which the inscription or other primary source evidence is discussed. Places and titles are only included if they are mentioned in more than one place or are an exception to the conventional terminology.

- Aebutius Agatho, [120](#)
- Aelia Restituta, Annia, [107–8](#)
- Aemilius Respectus, M., [138](#)
- Aemilius Superus, M., [138](#)
- Agileius Primus, G., [95–96](#), [124](#)
- Agrippina (wife of Claudius), [55–56](#), [97](#)
 - priest of, [55](#)
- Agrippina (wife of Germanicus), [47](#), [89](#)
- Albucia Candida, [104](#), [108](#)
- altar, [50](#), [57](#), [81–82](#), [84–85](#), [88–89](#), [107](#), [125](#), [137](#)
 - See also names of individuals*
 - Antoninus Pius and Faustina, [95](#)
 - Augustus and Claudius, [82–83](#)
 - Lugdunum, [10](#), [51](#)
 - Narbo, [80–81](#)
 - as symbol of deification, [20](#), [80](#), [98](#)
- Ammicar, [58](#)
- ancestry, [43–44](#), [48](#), [77](#)
 - divine, [5](#), [9](#), [43](#), [59–60](#), [68](#), [86–87](#), [101](#), [108](#)
- Annobal Himilcho Rufus, [57–58](#)
- Annobal Tapapius Rufus, [57–58](#)
- Antonia (mother of Germanicus), [45](#), [47](#), [89](#), [96](#)
 - priestess of, [55](#)
 - as *sacerdos* of Divus Augustus, [97](#)
- Antonia Picentina, [103–4](#)
- Antoninus Pius
 - dedication to, [123](#), [125](#)
 - sacrifice to, [95](#)
 - statue of, [104](#)

- temple to?, [83](#)
- Aponius . . . , L., [58](#)
- Aponius Rufinus, L., [126](#)
- arch, [43–44](#), [46–48](#)
 - for Drusus (the elder), [46–47](#)
 - for Gaius and Lucius Caesar, [29](#), [47](#)
 - for Germanicus, [47](#)
- Artorius Bassus, G., [83](#)
- Astius Dinamius, [142–43](#)
- Astius Mustelus, [135](#), [142–43](#)
- Astius Vindicianus, [142–43](#)
- **Augustalis*, [53–54](#), [95–96](#), [111–29](#)
 - corporati*, [115](#), [121](#)
 - curator Augustalium*, [115](#)
 - magister*, [111](#), [117](#)
 - quattuorvir*, [117](#)
 - seviratus*, [126](#)
 - seviri Augustales corporati*, [121](#)
- Augustus, [2](#), [4–5](#), [7](#), [9–10](#), [16–17](#), [23–28](#), [30](#), [31](#), [33–38](#), [44](#), [66](#), [134](#)
 - altar of, [50](#), [81–82](#), [84](#)
 - dedication to, [116](#)
 - epithet, [12](#), [125](#), [127](#)
 - funeral of, [7](#), [16](#), [24](#)
 - priest of, [10](#), [44](#), [55](#), [57–60](#), [67–69](#), [74](#), [78–80](#), [82–84](#), [86–87](#), [97](#), [106](#), [138](#)
 - statue of, [47](#)
 - temple of, [27](#), [33–34](#), [46](#), [50](#), [72–73](#), [83–85](#), [94](#)
- banquet, [28–29](#)
 - as benefaction, [13](#), [53](#), [99](#), [113](#), [116](#), [122](#), [125](#)
- Basilius Cirrenianus, [143–44](#)
- Basilius Flaccianus, Q., [143–44](#)
- benefaction, [12](#), [54](#), [85](#), [99–100](#), [131–33](#), [139–40](#)
 - imperial, [55–56](#), [66](#), [97](#)
 - local, [4](#), [53](#), [61](#), [77](#), [87–88](#), [94](#), [99–103](#), [106](#), [109](#), [115–16](#), [122](#), [125](#), [137–40](#)
 - summa honoraria*, [97](#), [99](#), [103](#), [113](#), [126](#)
- Caecilius Gallus, G., [75](#)
- Caligula, [55](#), [93–96](#), [124–25](#)
- Caracalla, [9](#)
 - priest of, [71–72](#), [76](#), [79](#), [138](#)
- Cassius Caecilianus, M., [67](#), [69](#)
- Catia Servata, [53–54](#), [105](#)
- Claudia (daughter of Nero), [93](#), [141](#)
- Claudius, [47](#), [82](#), [86](#)

- priest of, [56](#), [72–74](#), [76](#), [87–88](#), [97](#)
- Claudius Sestius, Ti., [88–89](#)
- Coelia Victoria Potita, [106](#)
- coinage, [31](#), [50–51](#), [70](#)
 - altar on, [81–82](#)
 - celebrating deification, [42](#), [93](#), [140–41](#)
 - celebrating family, [51](#)
 - temple on, [19](#), [33](#), [50](#), [140–41](#)
- collective worship, [29](#), [44](#), [55](#), [61–62](#), [68–71](#), [78](#), [81–86](#), [89–91](#), [95–98](#), [100–102](#), [107](#)
- colonia*, [11](#), [55](#), [69](#), [111](#), [113](#), [122–23](#), [128](#), [139](#)
 - Arelate, [120](#), [125](#)
 - Augusta Emerita, [36–38](#), [49–50](#), [68](#), [82–83](#), [122](#)
 - Carthage, [76](#), [83–84](#), [113](#), [123](#), [138](#)
 - Lepcis Magna, [57](#), [60](#), [76](#), [85–91](#), [123](#), [137](#)
 - Narbo, [58](#), [80–81](#), [120–21](#), [126](#)
 - Nemausus, [65](#), [68](#), [120–21](#), [125](#)
 - Ostia, [95](#), [114](#)
 - Pax Iulia, [37–38](#), [49](#)
 - Pisa, [26–32](#)
 - Tarraco, [33–34](#), [36](#), [68](#), [72–75](#), [81–82](#)
 - Trier, [29–30](#), [120](#)
- Cominius Abascantus, Q., [115–16](#), [127](#)
- Commodus, [2](#), [122](#), [125–27](#)
- Cornelius Bassus, [60](#)
- Cornelius Minicianus, G., [65](#)
- Cornelius Orfitus, Ser., [86–87](#)
- Cornelius Proculus, M., [59–60](#)
- Cornelius Severus, Gn., [37](#), [50](#)
- Cornelius Vetulus, G., [59](#)
- Crispina, [125](#), [127](#)
- Crittia Priscilla, [55](#)
- Crittius Firmus, P., [55](#)
- curator*, [95](#), [115](#), [120](#), [137–39](#), [144](#)
- decurions, [30–34](#), [65](#), [96](#), [104](#), [107](#), [113–17](#)
- dedication formula
 - decreto decurionum*, [38](#), [51](#), [73](#), [95](#)
 - ob honorem*, [101](#), [126](#), [140](#)
 - pro salute*, [56](#), [62](#), [70](#), [76](#), [90](#), [95–96](#), [102](#), [122](#), [124–27](#)
 - votum solvit/voverat* (see [vows](#))
- deification
 - as competition, [2](#), [5](#), [15–16](#), [18–24](#)
 - as consolation, [2–3](#), [78–79](#)

- as legitimization, [2](#), [7](#), [9–10](#), [16](#), [25](#), [43](#), [101](#), [126](#)
- witnessed, [24](#)
- Domitian, [17](#), [69](#), [88–89](#), [90](#), [115](#), [116](#)
- Domitilla (wife of Vespasian?), [93](#), [103](#)
- domus Augusta*, [6](#), [12](#), [19](#), [47](#), [120](#), [125](#), [129](#)
 - priest of, [69](#)
 - priestess of, [98](#)
- domus divina*, [6](#), [12](#), [98](#), [102](#), [125](#), [129](#)
- Drusilla, [7](#), [24](#), [93](#), [94](#), [129](#)
 - dedication to, [95](#), [124–25](#)
 - funeral of, [7](#), [24](#), [94](#)
 - priests of, [103](#)
- Drusus (father of Claudius), [10](#), [46–47](#), [51](#), [60](#)
- Drusus (brother of Germanicus), [11](#), [19](#), [25](#), [33](#), [132](#)
 - as *flamen divi Augusti*, [60](#), [79](#)
 - dedication to, [60](#)
 - funeral of, [48](#)
 - honors for, [43](#), [48–49](#)
 - priest of, [44](#), [68](#)
 - statue of, [89](#)
- Egnatuleus Seneca, G., [74](#)
- Faustina (wife of Antoninus Pius), [93](#), [95](#)
 - priestess of, [103–5](#)
- Faustina (wife of Marcus Aurelius), [93](#), [103](#)
 - priestess of?, [104–5](#)
- flamen*, [20](#), [43](#), [45](#), [55](#), [63–65](#), [67–68](#), [82](#), [100](#)
 - See also names of individuals*
 - Augustalis*, [30](#), [43](#), [67](#)
 - of deified individual, [18](#), [20](#), [45](#), [55](#), [60](#), [65](#), [67–69](#), [73–76](#), [82–83](#), [86–88](#), [104](#), [106](#), [138–39](#), [143](#)
 - of emperor and *divi*, [73](#)
 - of living individual, [37–38](#), [44](#), [50–51](#), [58–60](#), [68–70](#), [86](#)
 - perpetuus*, [65](#), [67](#), [69–71](#), [88–89](#), [99](#), [107–8](#), [135–44](#)
 - of provincial cult, [64](#), [73](#), [75](#)
 - Romae et Augusti*, [44](#), [67–68](#)
 - spelling variations, [68](#)
- flamen Dialis*, [19](#), [63–64](#), [101](#)
- flaminica*, [64](#), [68](#), [93](#), [97–98](#), [100](#), [102–3](#)
 - of deified individual, [98](#), [104](#), [106–7](#)
 - divarum Augustarum*, [98](#)
 - of living individual, [53–55](#), [105–6](#)
 - perpetua*, [99](#), [101](#), [107–8](#)

Flavius Aquilinus, 137

Fonteius Maternus Novatianus, L., 73

Fulvius Saturninus, M., 60–61, 86

Furius Saturninus, A. 116–17

Gaius Caesar, 11, 16, 19, 34–35, 43–47, 49, 132

honors for, 26–32

temple of, 26

games, 33, 65, 93, 113

as benefaction, 53, 99, 107, 113, 117, 122

funeral, 23–24

procession of images at (*pompa circensis*), 18–20, 24–26, 46

Gellius Georgus, Sex., 115

genius, 6, 12

of **Augustales*, 115, 126–27

of Caesar/imperial family members, 117

of community, 102, 125

of *divus/diva*, 20

of emperor, 56–57

Germanicus, 11, 19, 37, 132

arch of, 44, 46–47

dedication to, 59–60

as *flamen divi Augusti*, 79

honors to, 22, 43–49

priest of, 37, 44, 50, 59, 68

sacrifices to the shades of, 46

statue of, 46–47, 89

supplicatio to, 48

Hadrian, 7, 29, 69

deification of Antinoös, 42

priest of, 104, 138

statue of, 101

Hellenistic ruler cult, 5, 12, 41, 62, 70

Holconius Celer, M., 57

Iddibal Pilo, 57–58

Juba II, 69–70

Julia (daughter of Titus), 93, 104

Julia Domna (Septimius Severus), 93, 96, 102

Julia Helias, 53–54

Julia Maesa, 93

Julius Caesar, 11, 38, 43, 46, 60, 94

altar to, 22–23

- funeral of, 16, 21–24
- honors to, 16–26
- Mark Antony as *flamen* of, 18–23, 63
- priest of, 75
- temple to, 22–25
- Julius Frontinus, Ti., 86–87
- Julius Nigrus, L., 121
- Julius Plotus, Q., 37, 49–50
- Julius Rufus, G., 43–44
- Julius Venustus, 82–83
- Lares, 117
- lex de Flamonio Proviniciae Narbonensis*, 63–64, 100–101
- Livia, 11, 45, 51, 54, 93–94, 132, 134
 - as priestess of Augustus, 10, 79, 97
 - dedication to, 59–60
 - honors to, 4, 54, 94
 - priest of, 37–38, 49–51
 - priestess of, 52–54, 102–3, 105–8
 - rejection of temple to, 35–38, 49
 - statue of, 89
 - temple to, 85, 106
- Livia (Wife of Drusus), 47, 89
- Lucilia Cale, 102
- Lucius Julianus, A., 116
- Lucius Proculus, A., 116
- Lucius Caesar, 11, 16, 19, 43–47, 49, 132
 - honors for, 26–35, 81
 - sacrifices to the shades of, 27, 46
 - temple of, 26
- Lucius Verus, 10, 101
- magistracies, 90, 112–14, 139
 - and *Augustales*, 111–14
 - honors associated with, 113
- Marcellus, 19, 24, 26, 46
- Marciana (sister of Trajan), 93, 103
- Marcus Aurelius (emperor), 2, 10
 - dedication to, 123, 126–27
 - priest of, 72
 - pro salute*, 76, 102
 - statue of, 101
- Marcus Aurelius (priest of Tiberius), 37–38, 51
- Mariniana (wife of Valerian I), 93

Matidia (neice of Trajan), 93, 103

models/precedent

actions of imperial family as, 34–36, 56, 66, 97, 107, 131

for establishing cult outside Rome, 5–6, 19, 27–32, 36–38, 41–42, 118, 121, 128, 132

for exceptional honors, 16–26, 41–49, 94–95

laws/*senatus consulta* as, 27, 81

priesthood as, 63–66, 100

municipium, 49, 69, 98, 113, 116–17, 122, 138–39

Olisipo, 37, 49–50, 122

Nanneia Instania Fida, 101

Nero, 20, 86–87, 141

Nerva, 73–74, 78, 101

priest of, 62, 72, 75–76

statue of, 115

numen, 6, 12, 56–57

of emperor, 80–81, 138

Nymphidia Monime, 115–16, 127

Passerius Afrus, G., 44

patronus, 23, 57–58, 61, 74, 83, 86–87, 90, 104, 120, 139–40

imperial family member as, 27, 31

Paulina (wife of Maximinus), 93

Perelius Hedulus, P., 77, 84

Pertinax, 7, 79

Plotina, 93, 132, 134

priestess of, 98, 103–5, 107–8

pontifex/pontifex, 59–60, 62, 66–71, 79–80, 83, 132, 137

pontifex divi Augusti, 67, 69

pontifex Caesaris/Caesarum, 59–60, 68,

pontifex perpetuus divorum et Augustorum, 69

Poppaea (wife of Nero), 93, 141

provincial cult, 2–6, 32–38, 43–44, 51, 63–64, 132, 143

See also flamen; sacerdos

cult centre, 33–34, 66, 72–73

priests of, 3–4, 6, 12, 43–44, 59, 63–64, 66–77, 98–100, 138, 142–44

Publicus Usulenus, 58

Sabina, 93

dedication to, 96

priestess of, 103–4

Sabius Tapapius, 86–87

sacerdos, 66, 98, 103

- See also names of individuals*
- of deified individual, 57, 103–6
- of emperor and divi, 62
- of living individual, 57
- of provincial cult, 43–44, 67, 137
- perpetuus*, 84
- Romae et Augusti*, 67
- sacerdotalis*, 67, 70, 137, 142–43
- sacrifices, 22–23, 27–29, 32, 46, 56, 65–66, 70, 80, 95, 98, 136, 141
- Secundius Zmaragdus, Q., 53–54, 105
- Senate
 - granting exceptional honors, 7, 15–24, 27, 32, 35, 38, 45, 48, 93–94, 96
 - senatus consultum*, 26, 29, 44–45
 - temple to (with Tiberius and Livia), 35–37
- Septimus Severus
 - connection to Marcus Aurelius, 2
 - funeral of, 7
 - pro salute*, 102
 - priests of, 71, 72, 79
 - temple to, 91
- sodales*, 10, 43, 46
- succession, imperial, 26, 36–37
 - See also* deification as legitimization
- statue, 7–8, 29, 42, 46–49, 56, 99–101, 103–4, 107–8, 115, 137–38, 140, 142
 - See also names of deified individuals*
- Statulenus Iuncus, T., 30–31
- symbolic capital, 53–54, 66, 84, 88, 113–14, 128, 131
- temple
 - See also names of deified individuals*
 - to Divus Vespasian, Divus Titus, and Domitian, 90–91
 - to Rome and Augustus, 33, 36–37, 61, 84–86, 89–91
 - as symbol of deification, 7–8, 12, 20, 25
- terminology, 5, 7, 16–19, 21
 - See also flamen; pontifex; sacerdos*
 - emperor worship vs. imperial cult, 1–3, 133
 - flamen* vs. *sacerdos*, 57, 66–80, 97–102
- theater, 8, 19, 33–34, 46, 49
 - as benefaction, 103–4, 113
- Tiberius, 11, 16, 25, 31, 34–38, 43, 45, 94
 - altar of, 82
 - dedication to, 61, 82
 - priest of, 37–38, 49–51, 60–61, 86

shrine to, [61](#), [82](#)

statue of, [89](#)

rejection of temple by, [35–37](#), [61](#)

Titus

priest of, [74–76](#)

statue of, [116](#)

temple of, [90](#)

Trajan, [75–76](#), [134](#)

dedication to, [125–26](#)

priest of, [69](#), [72](#), [74](#), [104](#), [138](#)

statue of, [115](#)

Trajan (father of Trajan), [78–79](#)

Valerius Paetus, G., [55](#)

Vespasian, [76](#), [116](#)

priest of, [72–74](#), [88–89](#), [104](#)

temple of, [90](#)

Vibidia Saturnina, [116–17](#)

Vipsania Agrippina (mother of Drusus), [89](#)

Vipsanius Clemens, M., [88](#)

vow, [22](#)

dedications, [80](#), [82](#), [88](#), [101–2](#), [107](#)

to emperors, [22](#), [24](#)

oath to Caligula's sisters included in, [96](#)